



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

This thesis has been submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for a postgraduate degree (e.g. PhD, MPhil, DClinPsychol) at the University of Edinburgh. Please note the following terms and conditions of use:

This work is protected by copyright and other intellectual property rights, which are retained by the thesis author, unless otherwise stated.

A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge.

This thesis cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the author.

The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the author.

When referring to this work, full bibliographic details including the author, title, awarding institution and date of the thesis must be given.

Belongingness in Practice: A Discursive Psychological Analysis of Aid Workers' Accounts of Living and Working in the Field

Anna-Kaisa Wilson

Doctorate
University of Edinburgh
2016

Declaration

I, Anna-Kaisa Wilson, declare that this thesis has been composed by me and that this is my own work, except as specified. I further declare that this work has not been submitted for any other degree or professional qualification.

Date:

Signature:

Abstract

The study described in this thesis represents one of the first attempts to explore belongingness as a practice among aid workers, and to contribute to our understanding of how people account for belonging in situ. In psychology, belongingness has predominantly been studied in laboratory settings, or among those who report not belonging in some way. This has led to concerns about ecological validity, and a neglect of 'real world' contexts in the development of belongingness theory. Through semi-structured interviews with 25 international aid workers, using web-based calling software (Skype), a discursive psychological approach was employed to rework belongingness as a discursive practice. Belonging was found to be an activity for which participants made themselves accountable, and in so doing worked to manage issues of blame and justification in their interactions. Aid workers constructed fitting in as necessary, but ultimately futile, formulating accounts around inherent and immutable differences with local people. The analysis also explored the ways in which participants constructed efforts to achieve belonging; much of which involved the manipulation of appearance, particularly the use of strategic dressing. Through analysis of participants' treatment of belonging in interaction it was found that, in practice, belonging was formulated as a continuum rather than a dichotomy.

Thank you so much

Sue and Bregje

Hunter and Marika

and

Adalene

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 1: Introduction	7
Introduction	14
Reactions to Fluctuations in Belongingness.....	17
Cognitive Reactions.....	18
Emotional Reactions	23
Behavioural Reactions.....	24
Processes Underlying Responses to Belongingness-Relevant Events	28
Biological Underpinnings of the Need to Belong.....	29
The Role of Individual Differences in Reactions to Threats to Belonging.....	35
Interpersonal sensitivity	35
Long-Term Consequences of a Thwarted Need to Belong	38
Conclusion.....	40
Use of Interview Data	45
Use of Internet Calling Software.....	49
Empirical Process	50
Pilot Study	50
Main Study	51
Data Collection, Participants and Interviews.....	51
Recruitment	52
Ethical Considerations.....	53
Data Analysis	53
Summary	56
Chapter 4: Belonging in Local Communities	57
Belonging as an Accountable Practice	59
Section Summary	69
Identity in Talk of Belonging	69
Section Summary	74
Conclusion.....	75
Chapter 5: Belonging and Dress.....	79
Analysis	81
Conclusions	96

Chapter 6: Security	99
Minimising the Security Threat	103
Constructing the Problem	106
Security Measures as Limiting Work	111
Security Measures as Limiting Everyday Activities.....	119
Security Measures as Limiting Belonging	124
Conclusions.....	130
Chapter 7: Discussion	134
Summary of Main Results	135
Methodological Contributions	140
Contributions to Aid and Development practice	142
Potential Limitations	142
Situating the Study in Psychological Literature.....	142
Methodological Concerns and the use of Interviews.....	143
Generalisability.....	144
Reflexivity	145
Conclusions.....	146

Chapter 1: Introduction

My interest in belonging began when, as a recent graduate of a master's programme in psychology, I took up a position as the psychosocial manager for a medical based NGO in Sri Lanka, after the 2004 'boxing day tsunami'. I was stationed in a town called Ampara, which was located on the east coast; the hardest hit region of the country. It was a unique situation. Many organisations were awash with donations, and because Ampara was the largest town in the region (although still very small), most NGOs and UN agencies had a base there. During my time in Ampara, about 18 months in total, I became familiar with some of the issues humanitarian workers face in their daily lives, whilst stationed in the field.

It was during this time that I first came to consider belonging in ways I had not before. As an aid worker, it was made clear to me that gaining acceptance in the local community would help ensure my safety and facilitate my work. Indeed, in a handbook published for aid professionals written by Kofi Annan (2000), former Secretary General of the United Nations, Mr Annan underlines the importance of what he terms 'proximity to affected populations'

White 4x4s, radios, guards, aid workers on short-term contracts moving from one crisis to the next, all form a barrier between those providing and those receiving assistance. Some aid workers have called for the value of proximity (to affected populations) to be given new prominence. This entails developing a relationship with the community—feeling concerned and building trust—even if it requires

taking some risks. Such an attitude may indeed necessitate abandoning 'the protective rituals that regulate the distance' (p 68)

We received no training in this aspect of our work, nor was it even acknowledged as work. Rather fitting in with locals was assumed to be something for which we needed no instruction; something we would intuitively know how to do, and so we were left to find our own way. My experience, however, and those that my friends and colleagues described to me, was quite the opposite. Contrary to our employer's assumptions, fitting in was neither intuitive nor easy. Indeed, I can recount a number of occasions, which I will not describe here for reasons of brevity, on which I clearly failed at being accepted. And I watched others like me, as they traversed, and sometimes stumbled in, the unfamiliar cultural terrain.

This was my first posting as an aid worker, and it was not long before I came to understand that trying to fit in and to achieve a sense of belonging in the community, was not only an effortful and conscious pursuit, but a preoccupation that touched almost every aspect of our life. Achieving belonging in the community is part of most aid organisations' security strategy (I discuss this in more detail later in this chapter), so the safety of those who failed to be accepted was said to be at risk. It is also generally understood, as articulated by Kofi Annan above, that in order to do good aid work, aid workers must gain the community's trust and willingness to work with them, and this can only be achieved by fitting in and establishing a degree of belonging. Therefore, if you failed at fitting in you also failed at being an aid worker.

Notions of belonging have no doubt always resonated to some extent among aid workers, who often live and work in communities other than their own. However, belongingness took on renewed significance around the turn of this century when, in 1998, Van Brabant proposed the 'security triangle' as a solution to the security problems most aid organisations had faced, for the first time, in the 1990s (Van

Brabant, 1998; Van Brabant, 2001). VanBrabant proposed a three-faceted approach to organisational security in the context of aid and development work, one of which is achieving acceptance or belonging in the communities in which you operate; the other two being protection and deterrence. Protection involves such activities as the use of body armour and security training, while deterrence constitutes the containment of threat by posing a counter threat such as legal reprisal (Van Brabant, 1998).

The model was quickly and widely taken up by those in the aid industry because aid organisations that found themselves the target of increasing numbers of attacks during the 1990s, were in need of a 'workable' security solution. The geopolitical climate changed during that decade. For the preceding century or so in which organised humanitarian help had operated across borders, aid workers had successfully relied on claims of neutrality and 'doing good' for protection in areas of conflict (MacPherson & Pafford, 2012). During the 1990s, however, it became increasingly clear that this strategy was no longer effective. A key moment in this shift occurred in the Somali civil war of 1991-1992, during which hundreds of thousands of Somalis starved (UN, 2015). In response, the international community resolved to send millions of tons of food aid, which was to be distributed by convoys of UN aid workers (UN, 2015). Despite delivering food to people on all sides of the conflict and providing nothing more political than simple sustenance, these convoys were regularly ambushed by armed militia and it is estimated over 80% of the food never reached its intended beneficiaries (UN, 2015). Eventually the U.S.A. volunteered to send in troops to secure the convoys, which they did with varying degrees of success (Gorman, 2001). However, this and other similar incidents in the nineties, led the aid industry to conclude the landscape in which aid was being delivered had shifted, and their previous reliance on neutrality and doing good was inadequate to ensure employees' safety. Below, the Director of CARE International reflects on this change in a recent employee handbook:

No longer can aid workers rely on the perception of 'good people doing good work' as their only protection (MacPherson & Pafford, 2012 p 9)

By the end of the 1990s therefore, aid organisations were looking for a viable alternative. The 'security triangle' paradigm of acceptance, protection and deterrence provided that alternative, and remains the conceptual basis for most aid agencies' operational security today (Fast, 2016). Indeed, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Japan puts it particularly succinctly "one must increase the level of acceptance by the community/society in order to create a secure environment for humanitarian operations" (www.mofa.go.jp, 2016).

Perhaps because of a lack of theoretical work on the security triangle since its inception almost two decades ago, developments have been limited. However, two key changes in the operationalisation of the security triangle have occurred in that time. The first is that greater emphasis has been placed on acceptance over the other two dimensions. As many agencies, such as the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) and the International Organisation for Migration (IOM), have devoted greater attention and resources to professionalising their operational security, they have increasingly moved beyond protection and deterrence to focus more attention on active acceptance strategies (Egeland, 2011; Stoddard & Harmer, 2010). This has involved spending considerable time and resources investing in the promotion of their mandates and adherence to humanitarian principles, deepening their analysis of conflict dynamics, as well as identifying and forging agreements with potential aggressors (Stoddard & Harmer, 2010). Indeed, the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Human Affairs (Unocha), which oversees the aid arm of the UN, argues in a report from 2011 that "the main building block to security must start with increasing acceptance" (Egeland et. al., 2011 p 48).

The second key development is that organisations have begun to target acceptance efforts at local government level rather than entirely at the level of community. This

has occurred partly in response to several incidents that took place during the early 2000s that shocked the aid industry and prompted many to call for wider efforts to secure acceptance in host countries. One such incident was the murder of 17 aid workers employed by a French NGO who were shot execution-style by the Sri Lankan army at the side of the road, after the mini bus in which they were travelling was stopped and searched in 2006 (BBC News, 2006). Host governments have a legal obligation to protect aid workers operating in their country under the Geneva Convention, International Humanitarian Law and under UN Charter. Rarely do field workers benefit from these laws however, because, as in the example of Sri Lanka in 2006 above, local governments frequently do not abide by them and local security forces are often unaware of their obligations in this regard (Stoddard, Harmer & Haver, 2006). Aid workers, then, must rely on building acceptance and achieving belonging at both community and local government levels, and even among local military groups to ensure their safety.

Yet, as I mentioned earlier, in my experience as an aid worker, we were provided no instruction in this aspect of our work; and it was absent from our guidelines and training manuals. As a psychologist I went to the literature for guidance on the practice of belonging, only to find there was no such literature. Years later in writing my doctorate several thorough searches of the literature over almost half a decade failed to turn up a single study looking at belonging or acceptance among aid workers. Some grey literature (studies and reports that have been published but not peer reviewed) is available on the internet about these topics, but this is largely instructional and descriptive (see “Aid Worker Security”, 2014; Bayode & Akinlabi, 2015; Harmer, 2006; Martin, 1999; Stoddard, Harmer & Haver, 2006). I was not able to find any studies of belonging or acceptance among aid workers; peer reviewed or otherwise. It seems remarkable given that any security strategy relying on acceptance is likely influenced by, and dependent on, the way in which it is implemented by aid workers. Understanding aid workers’ acceptance practises seems a key element in operationalising the security triangle, yet this aspect of the

theory remains absent in the literature. As a result of this lack of literature, the background for my study comes from a wider reading of belonging as studied in psychology.

The sense of belonging, when studied in psychology and sociology, is often referred to as belongingness (see Baumeister & Sommer, 1997; Lee & Robbins 1995; Levett-Jones & Lathlean, 2008; Nifadkar & Bauer, 2015). The definition of belongingness has changed over time, shifting between being conceptualised as a feeling or a state. Generally, now, the term belongingness describes the sense of being accepted by another individual or group. It is generally seen to be related to other psychological concepts such as identity, place identity and place attachment. Though psychologists have also studied it in relation to group identity, affect, self-regulation and conformity. Belongingness has been shown to influence a number of aspects of our lives; from the achievement of students in school to suicidal ideation.

As I pointed out above, one aspect of belonging missing from aid work literature to date is that of belonging as a practice, and it is this aspect of belonging, therefore, that is examined in this thesis using a discursive psychological approach. Discursive psychology provides a method by which practitioners may 'respecify' and critique psychological concepts, and involves reworking psychological topics as discourse practices (Edwards, 2005). Examples to date include memory and causal attribution (Edwards & Potter, 1992, 1993), attitude measurement (Potter, 1998; Potter and Wetherell, 1988) and identity (Antaki & Widdicombe, 1998). In recent decades, largely since the crisis in social psychology of the 1970s, discursive alternatives to mainstream methodologies have provided new insights into psychological constructs with a particular focus on elucidating how such constructs are practised; taken up, produced, negotiated and achieved through interaction. I will argue that a discursive psychological approach, therefore, lends itself to the study of belongingness as an interactional practice.

The second chapter contains a review of relevant past research and theory in the study of belonging/ness and the field of international aid. I trace the historical development of the theory of belonging in psychology and consider current theoretical understandings of belonging. I also provide an overview of aid and development literature to date, and identify key gaps and critiques in the literature of both fields of study. Chapter three presents the methodology used for this thesis. In particular, I argue the value in taking a social discursive approach to psychological research – that is, treating language as socially constructive of reality and as performing a range of social functions – rather than treating language simply as a neutral representation of reality. I also engage with critiques of research interviews as unnatural data and as such less useful than other types of data for discursive analysis. The way in which data was collected and analysed is detailed, as well as participant recruitment and ethical considerations. In the fourth chapter I examine participants' discussions of belonging in the communities in which they lived while doing aid work. I show how participants manage issues of blame in their accounts of fitting in or not, while avoiding the potentially negative inferences for their own identities associated with placing blame on locals. In the fifth chapter I look at one way in which the participants described bringing about belonging – through modifying the way they dressed. I outline the various ways dress is accounted for, and show how participants construct dress as a tool through which (some degree of) acceptance by locals can be achieved. The sixth chapter concerns participants' discussions of security. I examine the way security is formulated as a problem by participants who construct security measures, rather than insecurity, as the salient complainable matter. Participants use belonging as one way in which to develop security measures as problematic. In the final chapter in this thesis I draw together the conclusions, relate these to previous research and existing theory, highlight the theoretical implications and practical applications, discuss the limitations of the study and provide suggestions for future research.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

In this chapter, I review the literature on belongingness, focussing on the development of the theory of belongingness and the ways in which it has been investigated as a psychological phenomenon. I begin by looking at literature on reactions to fluctuations in belongingness, since this aspect of belonging has been central to developing a theory of belongingness in psychological literature. I categorise these reactions into three groups; cognitive, behavioural and emotional effects. These categories were chosen because they map neatly onto the kinds of investigations conducted on belonging. I then review literature on individual differences in reactions to belongingness status, with a particular focus on findings from studies of interpersonal sensitivity. Finally, I examine studies focused on the long term consequences of a thwarted, or unmet, need to belong. Throughout the chapter I relate, where appropriate, research findings to the context of aid work. I also highlight omissions in the literature, as well as areas requiring further development, and show how the research conducted for this thesis helps fill some of these gaps.

INTRODUCTION

Belonging, or belongingness as it has come to be known among psychologists, has several complementary definitions in the literature. Social scientists have defined

belongingness as the experience of personal involvement (in a system or environment) to the extent that the individual feels them self to be an integral part of that system (Anant, 1967). Maslow (1987) explains belongingness as the human need to be accepted, recognised, valued and appreciated by a group of other people. One of the most comprehensive definitions of belongingness comes from the work of psychologists Baumeister and Leary (1995), which was further developed by Somers (1999, p.16)

The need to be, and perception of being, involved with others at differing interpersonal levels...which contributes to one's sense of connectedness (being part of, feeling accepted, and fitting in), and esteem (being cared about, valued and respected by others), while providing reciprocal acceptance, caring and valuing to others

References to belonging have appeared in various forms since it was first mentioned in modern writing in the 19th century. At that time philosophers including Tönnies, Durkheim and Marx used the concept to describe the different ways people belong to collectivities, and the alienation of moments when such belongings are displaced as a result of industrialisation and migration (Yuval-Davis, 2006). The discipline of psychology, which emerged as the nineteenth century receded into the twentieth, developed in this intellectual landscape. Perhaps unsurprisingly, then, belonging became a central concern for early psychologists including Adler, Maslow and to a lesser degree, Freud.

Working in the early decades of the twentieth century Freud (1940) emphasised the importance of the filial bond, particularly to one's mother, which was later in life replaced, he theorised, by sexual drive. This theory of the importance of the bond between mother and child might be considered the first examination of belonging in the field of psychology. However, it was Freud's colleague Adler for whom belonging would become a central and explicit concern. Adler (1930) argued that an

individual's sense of belonging to a group, whether family, work or otherwise, was critical to their psychological wellbeing. He conceived of belonging as one of the most basic and irreducible human drives (Adler, 1930). This position stood in contrast to the widely accepted work of Freud (1940), for whom the pursuit of pleasure was a human being's most fundamental drive. Adler (1930) proposed that an individual's striving towards significance and belonging can be viewed as a pattern, and that this pattern manifests early in life and can be observed as a theme throughout an individual's lifetime. He argued a person's sense of belonging permeates all aspects of their perception and action. Adler's work in the 1930s was a pivotal moment in the study of belonging because it established belonging as a legitimate concern for psychologists. His work also introduced the idea of belonging as an innate drive or need, and this has informed the study of belonging through the decades, and remains widely accepted among psychologists today. Indeed, when Baumeister and Leary's seminal and highly influential paper on belonging was published in 1995, their purpose was to assemble the evidence necessary to establish belonging as a fundamental human need.

While some studies were conducted on belonging in the decades following Adler's work it was Baumeister and Leary's highly influential paper in 1995 that reignited interest in belonging among psychologists. In this paper the authors aimed to provide empirical evidence, through the meta-analysis of multiple published studies, to support claims of the existence of an innate need to belong among humans (Baumeister & Leary, 1995). Until Baumeister and Leary's paper was published claims to innateness in the field of belonging were not uncommon, however most theorists failed to provide systematic empirical evidence on which to base those claims. Many such claims refer back to Maslow's work on motivation - which was almost certainly influenced by Adler although, as has been typical of Adler's work, he is not credited (for discussion of Adler's work used without attribution see Ellenberger, 1970). In 1943, Maslow proposed a hierarchy of needs to describe human motivation, on which he placed love and belonging third; after just

safety and physiological needs. Maslow theorised that after humans' need for physical safety and biological imperatives such as food and water were met, the next need to which we would attend is achieving a sense of love and belonging (Maslow, 1943). However, Maslow's hierarchy was entirely theoretical, based not on empirical evidence but proposed as a model for which later studies would provide evidence (Maslow, 1943). With regard to belonging, however, those studies were never done. It is this issue that Baumeister and Leary (1995) highlighted and attempted to remedy; and in their estimation, they largely did this. They found evidence of a basic desire to form social attachments; i.e. that people form social bonds readily, even under seemingly adverse conditions. Moreover, people resist losing attachments and breaking social bonds, even if there is no material or pragmatic reason to maintain the bond and even if maintaining it would be difficult (Baumeister & Leary, 1995). They claimed to have found "abundant evidence" (p. 520) that the need to belong also shapes emotion and cognition; that forming or solidifying social attachments generally produces positive emotion, whereas real, imagined, or even potential threats to social bonds generate a variety of unpleasant emotional states. Their analysis also established that deficits in belongingness lead to a variety of ill effects, consistent with their argument that belongingness is a need (as opposed to merely a want).

REACTIONS TO FLUCTUATIONS IN BELONGINGNESS

The studies Baumeister and Leary (1995) reviewed were not designed to directly evaluate a belongingness hypothesis. Therefore, most of the evidence they presented provided only indirect support for their arguments. Work in the last decade has seen a focus of research attention on a number of key areas in an effort to develop our understanding of belongingness among humans and to provide the missing empirical evidence. Studies on belongingness have largely taken one of two forms; either laboratory experiments in which belongingness variables are

manipulated, or among people who claim not to belong in some particular way (for example at school or in large organisations). This work has provided a nascent body of knowledge which I review in the following sections and discuss the possible implications of these findings for aid workers. The literature is organised by the type of psychological reaction to fluctuations in belongingness being investigated; cognitive, behavioural and emotional. I then examine the possible underlying processes of these reactions, individual differences in reactions to belongingness status, and finally the potential long term consequences of a thwarted, or unmet, need to belong.

Cognitive Reactions

Baumeister and Leary (1995) argued that threats to belonging should lead to an increased cognitive focus on relationships and social connections which, by consuming limited cognitive resources, may lead to impairments in processing in other domains. Research conducted with individuals either randomly assigned to experience social exclusion or high on measures of chronically unmet belonging needs has shown a number of effects. Studies in which social exclusion was generated as a condition, typically either use a set up in which actors exclude the participant from an activity such as a game or conversation, or use a 'future alone' strategy in which participants are asked to take a personality test and provided false feedback that they will end up alone. The following text is a typical example of such 'feedback':

You're the type who will end up alone later in life. You may have friends and relationships now, but by your mid-20s most of these will have drifted away. You may even marry or have several marriages, but these are likely to be short-lived and not continue into your 30s. Relationships don't last, and when you're past the age where people are constantly forming new relationships, the odds are you'll end up being alone more and more.

In contrast, the future-belonging participants receive feedback such as the following:

You're the type who has rewarding relationships throughout life. You're likely to have a long and stable marriage and have friendships that will last into your later years. The odds are that you'll always have friends and people who care about you.

Control groups receive future misfortune feedback such as this:

You're likely to be accident prone later in life—you might break an arm or a leg a few times, or maybe be injured in car accidents. Even if you haven't been accident prone before, these things will show up later in life, and the odds are you will have a lot of accidents.

In these studies, unmet belongingness was associated with better memory for interpersonal and social events, greater attention to and processing of vocal tone in speech, greater accuracy in identifying emotions in faces, and more accuracy in understanding others' thoughts and feelings (Gardner, Pickett, Jefferis, & Knowles, 2005; Pickett, Gardner, & Knowles, 2004). These studies suggest that threats to belongingness and chronic unmet belonging needs are associated with greater attention to and processing of socially relevant information. Relatedly, when participants' belongingness was threatened by the delivery of false feedback that they would suffer a future alone, performance on a variety of complex cognitive tasks that were framed as diagnostic of social skills was improved relative to participants who either received feedback of future acceptance by others or no feedback (DeWall, Baumeister & Vohs, 2008). That is, participants whose belongingness was threatened appeared to focus their cognitive energies on tasks that could demonstrate improved social prospects. Furthermore, after recalling an episode of rejection, the salience of social groups appears to increase. Following a belongingness threat, individuals have been shown to complete more word fragments with group-relevant words, to identify group identity words faster, to describe themselves in reference to groups, and to rate their own groups as more important and cohesive than participants who recalled an episode of acceptance, physical distress, or academic failure (Knowles & Gardner, 2008). Participants

whose need to belong is threatened by feedback regarding a future alone or by watching a movie clip that induces loneliness, also report stronger beliefs in supernatural agents and describe pets with more social-connection traits than participants who received future acceptance feedback or watched a neutral or a fear-inducing movie clip (Epley, Akalis, Waytz, & Cacioppo, 2008). Thus, belongingness-deprived individuals appear to anthropomorphize nonhuman agents, perhaps to provide a social outlet. Research has also demonstrated that when the need to belong is threatened, cognitive processing of non-social, complex stimuli appears to suffer. This is consistent with Baumeister and Leary's (1995) suggestion that belongingness threats may tax cognitive resources. For example, participants who received false feedback that they would have a lonely future subsequently performed worse on an intelligence test; on recalling complex passages; and on answering complex analytical questions compared to participants who received future acceptance or future non-social misfortune feedback (Baumeister, Twenge, & Nuss, 2002). Participants who relived an episode of betrayal have also been shown to perform worse on complex cognitive tasks than participants who relived an experience of severe physical injury (Chen, Williams, Fitness, & Newton, 2008). However, participants' performance on easy tasks or on simple recall in these studies was not affected by rejection experiences (Baumeister et al., 2002; Chen et al., 2008). Evidence from these studies suggests then that threats to belonging lead to impairments on complex, higher-order cognitive processing, but more basic cognitive processing is not affected.

There are potentially serious problems with ecological validity in these studies which is discussed later in the chapter. Experiments are typically conducted in laboratory settings that are very different from the contexts in which aid workers find themselves in the course of their work. The extent to which findings from studies conducted in laboratory settings are useful for understanding belongingness among aid workers in the field is questionable. However, they may be one way of exploring possible future directions for such research. For this reason, reactions to

fluctuations in belonging among participants in laboratory experiments can only suggest, rather than define, aid workers' experience of belonging. If we extrapolate directly from an experimental to a real-world context these findings suggest that those who live and work in unfamiliar communities, as aid workers frequently do, may experience deficits in cognitive processing for complex tasks. Aid workers who arrive and feel little sense of belonging in the community, and perhaps also among co-workers, will be using limited cognitive resources to focus on relationships and social connections, potentially to the detriment of their work. It would seem, then, that aid organisations would be well advised to help new aid workers to develop a sense of belonging as quickly as possible after arriving in a new location. In doing so new employees will more quickly be able to focus on their work and devote cognitive processing to achieving organisational goals rather than belonging.

One way in which to do this may be to consider the evidence from studies examining cognitive reactions to events that suggest the possibility of future acceptance, offering fulfilment of one's need to belong. For example, in a study of the effects of minimal belonging cues, participants told they shared a birthday with a high achiever in mathematics persisted more on unsolvable mathematics puzzles and expected greater feelings of belongingness in a university mathematics department (Walton & Cohen, 2009). Mediation analyses suggested that greater feelings of mathematics-related belonging led to greater persistence on the mathematics tasks. Furthermore, being randomly assigned to work alone on mathematics problems after being designated as part of a mathematics group (rather than as an individual "mathematics person") increased persistence on mathematics puzzles. Finally, when the mathematics department was portrayed as encouraging social relationships, participants again persisted more on mathematics problems and also reported greater motivation for mathematics than participants to whom the department was portrayed as encouraging individual achievement. These findings suggest that even subtle cues that suggest the possibility of future acceptance is enough to motivate better performance and higher persistence in an

achievement domain. Issues of ecological validity notwithstanding, these findings suggest aid organisations may be able to positively influence the quality of, and commitment to, a new employee's work simply through the suggestion of future belonging, rather than having to effect any real change in their actual state of belonging. For example, simply by being reminded of similarities between themselves and the existing group or community (as in the shared birthday case above), an aid worker may improve their work performance even if their degree of actual belonging has not changed.

Analogous to other motivational drives, Baumeister and Leary (1995) argue that the need to belong should be subject to satiation, meaning that once the need is satisfied, the motivation to pursue additional social relationships should be diminished. There is some evidence supporting this aspect of their theory, for example, participants who were told they would have a future full of good social relationships performed worse on subsequent cognitive tasks that were framed as diagnostic of social skills compared to participants who received future alone or no feedback. Suggesting that participants with adequate levels of belonging were less willing to work for evidence of further social success (DeWall et al., 2008). However, when these same tasks were not framed as evidence of social skill, the performance of participants who received the acceptance feedback did not decline. These findings suggest that the need to belong is indeed subject to satiation and perceptions of opportunities to fulfil this need only lead to social effort when the need is threatened or unfulfilled.

There may be potential drawbacks, however, in quickly facilitating feelings of belonging among new aid workers. A corollary of the satiation hypothesis is that opportunities for social connection should only be motivating when belonging needs are not satisfied. In one study, participants who expected to meet a fellow university student rated the potential for social reward (i.e. meaningful connection) they saw in the interaction, then recorded a video greeting for their interaction

partner (MacDonald, Tackett, & Borsook, 2009). Among participants randomly assigned to a control condition, opportunities for social reward were unrelated to prosocial video greetings. Only among participants who had just relived a past social exclusion experience did the perceived opportunity for social reward predict more positive social greetings. These data suggest that only when deficits in belongingness are experienced do social opportunities motivate efforts at social connection. Again, while we cannot necessarily confidently extrapolate these findings to a real-world context they make us aware of possible factors in belonging which might mediate motivation to connect with others in prosocial ways. Aid workers who do not feel a deficit in belonging may therefore be less likely to work hard at gaining social acceptance either in the community or among colleagues. Organisations that rely on acceptance as part of their security strategy would need to provide further encouragement for employees to pursue belonging in the community, even after their own belongingness needs are met. So employees who have settled in a location and made friends, perhaps among other expats, may need other incentives to continue seeking belonging in the community.

Emotional Reactions

Baumeister and Leary (1995) argued that threats to the need to belong should have profound consequences for one's emotions because such threats to social connections signal danger to one's survival. Many studies have assessed emotional reactions to threats to belonging, but the evidence for negative emotional reactions to social exclusion has been mixed. Some researchers have found no differences in reported emotions between participants whose need to belong has been threatened and those who have not received such threats (Baumesiter et al., 2002; DeWall & Baumeister, 2006; Maner, DeWall, Baumeister, & Schaller, 2007; Twenge, Baumeister, Tiggmce, & Stucke, 2001). However, in a number of studies, effects of threats to belonging on emotional responses have been found. For example, some studies have found evidence for higher levels of negative affect among excluded participants (Baumesiter et al., 2002; Blackhart, Eckel, & Tice, 2007; Maner et al.,

2007; Murray, Derrick, Leder, & Holmes, 2008; Reijntjes, Stegge, Terwogt, Kamphuis, & Telch, 2006; Twenge et al., 2001), whereas others have found evidence for lower levels of positive mood (Blackhart et al., 2007; Mendes, Major, McCoy, & Blascovich, 2008; Twenge et al., 2001, study 5; van Beest & Williams, 2006). Indeed, mixed evidence has been found not just across studies but across participants within a single study. For example, in one study, only 38% of participants showed a reliable worsening of mood after an experience of rejection. Further, whereas many of the aforementioned studies have examined emotion by grouping together various feeling states, studies in which specific emotions have been examined have shown socially threatened participants to report more anger (Chow, Tiedens, & Govan, 2008; Mendes et al., 2008), sadness (Chow et al., 2008), and self-conscious emotions such as shame and embarrassment (Dickerson, Mycek, & Zaldivar, 2008; Gruenewald, Kemeny, Aziz, & Fahey, 2004). These contradictory findings have not been resolved and it remains unclear why some studies have found differences in emotion and others have not. A resolution of these contradictions may require deeper understanding of the processes that underlie responses to threats to belonging and a greater understanding of individual differences that influence how people interpret and react to threats to belonging. For example, individuals' propensity to experience positive emotions (extroversion) and negative emotions (neuroticism) in general may be important in determining emotional responses. For aid workers, results so far, while inconclusive, indicate that the emotional impact of not being accepted in a community will likely vary between aid workers. Employers of aid workers therefore, may need to provide greater support and increased resources for emotional coping to some employees, as the impact of not belonging induces a stronger reaction in some.

Behavioural Reactions

Perhaps the most straightforward prediction of behaviour following threats to belongingness is that excluded individuals should seek reparative sources of connection (Baumeister & Leary, 1995). The data, however, are not nearly as

straightforward as might be expected. The results of some experiments show that participants whose need to belong is threatened respond to others in an antisocial manner that seems more likely to drive people away than to create opportunities for connection (Krämer, Hoffmann & Eimler, 2015; Underwood & Ehrenreich, 2014). In particular, many studies have found behavioural responses to threats to belonging that suggest rejected participants are more motivated to retaliate against the person who has rejected them than to seek connection with others (for a review, see Leary, Twenge, & Quinlivan, 2006). For example, when participants received false feedback of a future alone (instead of feedback of future acceptance or misfortune) and were then provoked by receiving a negative evaluation from a confederate, rejected participants provided more negative job evaluations of the confederate (Twenge et al., 2001). Also, participants who were told that no fellow participants wanted to work with them, and then received a negative evaluation from a confederate, subsequently delivered more intense noise blasts to the confederate (Twenge et al., 2001). Although the aforementioned studies involved not only rejection, but also subsequent provocation, other studies that included an experience of exclusion by other participants, but no further provocation, have found similar results. For example, participants who played a computer ball-toss game with two others, but were excluded from a second game, selected more undesirable snacks for the other players (Chow et al., 2008). Even when participants are financially rewarded for being excluded, they are more likely to desire retaliation against the other players than those who are included (van Beest, & Williams, 2006). There is also some evidence that feeling a lack of belongingness in the workplace is associated with more harmful and less helpful behaviours, as rated by supervisors (Thau, Aquino, & Poortvliet, 2007). Furthermore, research has also shown that participants who were rejected by someone who was perceived to be a member of a group were willing to aggress against the entire group (and not just the individual group member responsible for the rejection) by administering higher noise blasts to all members of the group relative to participants who were not rejected by the group (Gaertner, Iuzzini, & O'Mara, 2008). However, participants did not retaliate

against the person who rejected them when administering a noise blast would have affected others who were not seen to belong to the same group as the person who did the rejecting (Gaertner et al., 2008). Although these examples of retaliation in response to exclusion may be seen as resulting from some degree of rejection and/or provocation by other participants or confederates, there is evidence of aggression against innocent bystanders following exclusion (Rios, Fast & Gruenfeld, 2015). In one such study, participants who were told that nobody wanted to work with them delivered more intense noise blasts to an unseen participant who had not behaved negatively in any way (Twenge et al., 2001). In another example, excluded participants donated less money to a charity than included participants (van Beest & Williams, 2006). Such antisocial behaviours are unlikely to help people re-establish social connections to others in order to restore feelings of belonging, and seem contrary to what Baumeister and Leary (1995) suggested people should be trying to do in response to rejection. While we must be cautious about generalising from behaviour observed in a laboratory setting, these results potentially raise interesting questions for aid organisations that rely on aid workers' continued pursuit of acceptance in a community as a security strategy. The results suggest that if rejected in some sense by even one member of a community, a person may behave negatively to other members of that community in response. Current evidence indicates that once rejected, an aid worker may be more inclined to respond in retaliatory rather than pro-social ways. The consequences of this on what is often already a tenuous and sometimes strained relationship between locals and aid workers could be potentially very damaging and, according to the theory behind the security triangle, dangerous as well.

Despite many findings of antisocial responses to rejection, some researchers have found evidence of desires for reconnection after a threat to belonging. For example, compared to participants who received feedback of future acceptance or future misfortune, participants who received feedback of a future alone preferred to work with others on a subsequent task instead of working alone (Maner et al., 2007).

Further, when participants received positive interpersonal evaluations after the future alone feedback, they evaluated a confederate positively (Twenge et al., 2001). Participants who wrote about a previous experience of exclusion expressed greater interest in using a student service for making new friends and participants who were told that nobody wanted to work with them evaluated new people as more attractive and sociable (Maner et al., 2007). Additionally, participants who were rejected based on their video greetings assigned more money to a new partner with whom they expected to interact (Maner et al., 2007). Also, women who were rejected by two other women throughout a conversation still indicated that they were willing to affiliate with these others midway through the interaction (Zwolinski, 2008). Together, these findings suggest that in some instances participants whose belongingness has been threatened do seek social connection with others. It is still unclear when and why people respond to threats to belonging in antisocial ways and when they respond in a more prosocial manner. Some have argued that people are more likely to respond to threats to belonging in antisocial ways when they feel anger towards those who reject them (Chow et al., 2008). Responding in antisocial ways may also be more likely when individuals are unable or unwilling to regulate their responses to threats to belongingness. However, there may be situations when people do make an effort to self-regulate and redirect their efforts to fulfilling the threatened need. Specifically, when individuals are given a chance to connect with someone other than their rejecter, they will make an effort to do so (although this effect was found only for individuals relatively low in social anxiety; Maner et al., 2007). However, when no opportunity to restore belongingness is available, individuals may see no payoffs in regulating their urge to reciprocate the antisocial behaviour directed at them and they may lash out at others – in many cases at those who rejected them – in order to retaliate. Some researchers have also suggested qualitative differences in belongingness threats that can influence individuals' reactions (Molden, Lucas, Gartner, Dean, & Knowles, 2009). For example, when people are explicitly rejected, a resulting focus on the prevention of further loss appears to prompt behaviours aimed at guarding against additional damage, such

as social withdrawal. However, when the failure to attain social gains is made salient, such as when one is ignored, a resulting focus on promoting gains appears to lead to efforts to re-establish social contact (Molden et al., 2009). Therefore, it appears important to be mindful that rejection differs not only in degree, but also in kind (Leary, 2005). In summary, research on behavioural reactions to threats to belongingness suggests that people often react to rejection in antisocial ways, particularly when they are provoked and do not have the opportunity to reconnect with others. In contrast, when socially non-anxious individuals are given an opportunity to reconnect with others, they have been found to respond to threats to belongingness in more prosocial ways.

Processes Underlying Responses to Belongingness-Relevant Events

There is currently disagreement among researchers about what can account for the demonstrated cognitive, emotional, and behavioural reactions to social exclusion threats. Some researchers argue that after experiencing threats to belongingness, self-regulatory capacity decreases (Baumeister et al., 2002; DeWall et al., 2008). These researchers argue that in response to threats to belonging, efforts to dampen emotional responses drain limited willpower resources, leading to a failure of self-regulation on subsequent tasks. This process of dampening emotion may explain why many studies find no change in emotional reaction following exclusion. Self-regulation deficits have been proposed as providing an explanation for why people are unable to perform complex tasks that require cognitive resources, and why people might react in antisocial ways that are unlikely to facilitate future chances of gaining belonging. In some cases, deficits in self-regulation are eliminated when individuals see opportunities to restore their sense of connection. Such opportunities may provide sufficient motivation to overcome exhausted willpower, leading to a strong effort to regulate reactions and thus more prosocial behaviours (DeWall et al., 2008). In contrast, researchers have also argued that threats to belonging lead to a temporary numbing or stunning of the emotional system such that the ability to experience emotions becomes blunted (DeWall & Baumeister,

2006). The basis of this argument is the hypothesis that the physical pain system provides part of the physiological basis for regulating reactions to social exclusion (Eisenberger, Lieberman, & Williams, 2003; MacDonald & Leary, 2005; Panksepp, 1998). If physical and social pain rely on overlapping physiological mechanisms, then just as physical injury causes temporary numbing of pain perception, social injury may also lead to a temporary numbing of the emotional system (DeWall & Baumeister, 2006; MacDonald & Leary, 2005). One implication is that if the emotional system is not functioning properly in response to threats to belongingness, then people may become less able to empathise with the feelings of others and may be temporarily unable to predict the emotional consequences of their own actions, which could lead to antisocial behaviour (DeWall & Baumeister, 2006).

BIOLOGICAL UNDERPINNINGS OF THE NEED TO BELONG

If the need to belong is a basic motivational drive, it may have an evolutionary basis, including biological mechanisms that regulate social behaviours (Baumeister & Leary, 1995). Some researchers have argued that one physiological mechanism involved in the regulation of threats to belonging is physical pain affect, or the sense of emotional unpleasantness that accompanies physical injury (Eisenberger et al., 2003; MacDonald & Leary, 2005; Panksepp, 1998). The need to avoid physical injury is an evolutionarily ancient problem. Pre-human animals had developed systems, including physical pain, for avoiding injury long before the regulation of social behaviour became important (Eisenberger & Lieberman, 2004). Once the regulation of social behaviour became a matter of life and death for social animals, social pain mechanisms may have 'piggybacked' on the physical pain system, taking advantage of an already developed system to respond quickly to crucial threats to survival (MacDonald & Leary, 2005). Much of the work looking at the biological underpinnings of the need to belong has been conducted using this framework and has sought to establish the connection between the physical and social pain systems.

Some researchers have examined the relation of the physical and the social pain systems by measuring pain sensitivity in response to threats to belonging. If physical and social pain share some of the same mechanisms, then threats to belonging should also affect responses to physical pain (DeWall & Baumeister, 2006; Eisenberger, Jarcho, Lieberman, & Naliboff, 2006; MacDonald & Leary, 2005). In a series of studies DeWall and Baumeister (2006) found evidence that threats to belonging lead to both emotional and physical numbing. For example, participants who were told that they would have a future alone subsequently showed increased pain tolerance (the time an individual can withstand a painful stimulus) and pain threshold (the point at which an aversive stimulus is first experienced as painful) relative to participants who did not receive such feedback. Emotional numbing was also noted in these studies. Participants who received feedback of a future alone predicted blunted emotional reactions to both negative and positive future events, and also showed less empathy toward others who experienced either a social rejection or a physical injury. These results suggest that physical sensation and emotional sensitivity become dulled after threats to belonging (DeWall & Baumeister, 2006). Similarly, decreased pain sensitivity has been shown in response to relived experiences of social betrayal and interactions with unfriendly others (Borsook & MacDonald, 2009). In contrast, in one study, when participants were excluded from a virtual ball toss game and were then exposed to a pain stimulus, they did not report lower unpleasantness of the pain stimulus than participants who were included in the game, which suggests that participants' pain sensitivity was not blunted in response to exclusion from the game (Eisenberger et al., 2006; see also MacDonald, 2008). In sum, although there is some mixed evidence, exclusion has been shown to lead to decreased sensitivity to physical pain across multiple studies. More work needs to be done to clarify the remaining discrepancies, such as work examining the relative effects of various forms of rejection on pain sensitivity.

Recently, researchers have also started to examine brain areas related to processing information relevant to the need to belong. In past research, it was established that the anterior cingulate cortex (ACC) is involved in processing the affective component of the pain response (e.g., Rainville, Carrier, Hofbauer, Bushnell, & Duncan, 1999) and that the right ventral prefrontal cortex (RVPFC) may regulate the affective responses to physical pain (Petrovic, Kalso, Petersson, & Ingvar, 2002). Nonhuman animal studies have also suggested that the periaqueductal gray (PAG) plays a role in processing pain-relevant stimuli, receiving input from both the ACC (An, Bandler, Öngür, & Price, 1998) and the body's injury detection system (Craig & Dostrovsky, 1999). Some studies have examined whether these same areas also play a role in responses to threats to belonging. For example, exclusion from an online ball tossing game has been shown to relate to greater activity in both the dorsal ACC and the RVPFC (Eisenberger et al., 2003). Further, activity in these two regions was negatively correlated, suggesting that the RVPFC may serve to down-regulate responses in the dorsal ACC. However, the dorsal ACC was also more active when participants just watched other players play, which may indicate that the dorsal ACC may be active regardless of whether exclusion is intentional or unintentional (Eisenberger et al., 2003). The effect of exclusion on dorsal ACC activity has since been replicated, with this work also revealing activation of the left amygdala and the left PAG (Eisenberger, Gable, & Lieberman, 2007; Eisenberger, Way, Taylor, Welch, & Lieberman, 2007). Of these three brain regions, only activity in the dorsal ACC was statistically related to greater self-reported social distress in response to exclusion. However, higher activity in all three regions during the laboratory social exclusion experience was associated with higher momentary social distress ratings following real-life social experience, providing evidence for the validity of the experimental findings. In contrast to these studies, a number of researchers have failed to find connections with the dorsal ACC or have found relations to rejection that are opposite in direction to the above findings. It is noteworthy that all of the above studies that have found the dorsal ACC to be active during rejection have used the virtual ball toss game to threaten participants' need to belong. Because one

can reasonably expect to be included in such a game, some researchers have argued that the effects of rejection and expectancy violation are confounded and any dorsal ACC activity may be attributable more to violated expectations than to feelings of rejection (Somerville, Heatherton, & Kelley, 2006). In one study attempting to separate the effects of expectancy violation and rejection, the dorsal ACC appeared to be more active when participants' expectations were violated regarding whether a target person would accept or reject them, whereas the ventral ACC was sensitive to the social implications of the feedback (Somerville et al., 2006). Another fMRI study manipulated belongingness threat via paintings with acceptance, rejection, non-social positive, and non-social negative themes (Kross, Egner, Ochsner, Hirsch, & Downey, 2007). Replicating the previous studies, activity in the dorsal ACC was higher when viewing rejection than acceptance paintings. However, such dorsal ACC activity was negatively related to social distress ratings, contradicting this aspect of Eisenberger and colleagues' findings. In the Kross et al. (2007) study, distress ratings were also negatively related to activity in the precentral gyrus, the left prefrontal cortex, the right dorsal superior frontal gyrus, and were positively related to activity in the left ventral prefrontal cortex. The authors argued that these results indicate that the ACC may function as a general purpose alarm system (cf. Eisenberger & Lieberman, 2004), which becomes activated when expectancies are violated leading to activation of the dorsal left prefrontal cortex to interpret events and regulate emotional responses. In summary, the findings regarding which brain areas are involved in processing information relevant to the need to belong generally point to areas that have also been found to be involved in the processing of physical pain affect. However, the findings addressing the role of these brain areas in processing belonging-relevant information have been inconsistent in some ways, and it is unclear exactly what function each area carries out. The greatest controversy seems to be around the role of the dorsal ACC in processing threats to belonging and whether this brain area is sensitive more specifically to rejection or more generally to expectancy violations.

Other potential physical mechanisms involved in reactions to belonging have been studied, such as the role of cortisol. Cortisol is released in times of stress and helps mobilize energy resources for response to stressful situations. Cortisol has been shown to be released in response to social threat (Blackhart et al., 2007; Tops, Riese, Oldenhinkel, Rijskijk, & Ormel, 2008; Zwolinski, 2008). Some studies have found evidence of increases in cortisol release in response to threats to belonging (for a review see Dickerson & Kemeny, 2004). For example, participants who were told that nobody chose to work with them had higher cortisol levels than participants in the control and acceptance conditions, who did not differ from each other (Blackhart et al., 2007). Another study found that participants who were most sensitive to signs of rejection (i.e., detected cues of rejection faster) also showed the highest release of cortisol in response to criticism (Dandeneau, Baldwin, Baccus, Sakellaropoulou, & Pruessner, 2008). In contrast to findings of increases in levels of cortisol in response to threats to belonging, one study found that individual differences in fear of negative evaluation were negatively related to cortisol release in the morning (Tops et al., 2008). Overall, the results of various studies appear to converge on the suggestion that cortisol release is related to responses to threats to belonging. However, this work suggests that the relation is not necessarily straightforward, with a number of moderators worthy of consideration. Furthermore, the timing of cortisol measurement has varied considerably across studies, an issue of particular importance given the tendency of cortisol levels to vary throughout the day. These different times of measurement are likely to contribute to the discrepancies in the findings.

Some researchers have also begun investigations of genetic markers that may be related to sensitivity to threats to belonging. For example, genetic polymorphisms related to monoamine oxidase-A (MAOA), an enzyme that degrades serotonin, dopamine, and norepinephrine, has been linked to aggressive behaviour and hypersensitivity to threats to belongingness (Eisenberger, Way et al., 2007). In one study, participants who had the MAOA-L genetic marker (related to heightened

aggressiveness) also showed greater activity in the dorsal ACC in response to exclusion from a virtual ball toss game (Eisenberger, Way et al., 2007).

Another biological response that has received research attention is resting heart-rate variability, or respiratory sinus arrhythmia (RSA). RSA has been associated with better situational regulation of responses under threat (Gyurak & Ayduk, 2008). Among individuals with low RSA, rejection sensitivity is related negatively to the effective regulation of emotional reactions and positively to exhibiting hostility in relationship conflicts. No such relations are found among individuals with high RSA (Gyurak & Ayduk, 2008). For people who are easily threatened by relationship events, such as people high in rejection sensitivity, high RSA may provide an important buffer aiding in healthy regulation of emotions (Gyurak & Ayduk, 2008). In fact, the likelihood of being in a romantic relationship for people high in rejection sensitivity increases with their level of RSA (Gyurak & Ayduk, 2008). One study examining nonhuman social animals investigated neuroendocrine reactivity to stress in rhesus monkeys reared by rejecting mothers (Maestripieri et al., 2006). In particular, these researchers examined levels of 5-HIAA, a serotonin metabolite, and HVA levels, a dopamine metabolite. The findings indicated that monkeys rejected by their mothers had lower concentrations of both of these metabolites. Furthermore, rejected monkeys who became abusive mothers themselves, including cross-fostered monkeys not reared by their biological mothers, had lower 5-HIAA levels than abused monkeys who did not become abusive mothers. These findings point to the importance of early experiences on neuroendocrine functioning, especially since the results cannot be attributed to genetic similarity. Current enthusiasm for investigations seeking neurological explanations for psychological phenomena have driven attempts to find a neurological basis to belongingness and related mechanisms in psychology. However, this area of exploration has so far yielded mixed results, with limited impact on our understanding of belonging. There may be other types of research that are more likely to produce coherent results, particularly real-world investigations conducted outside both the laboratory

and positivist experimental design. Later in the chapter I discuss this further and argue the value of research into the belonging as a practice.

THE ROLE OF INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCES IN REACTIONS TO THREATS TO BELONGING

In order to resolve and explain inconsistent findings in many areas of the literature on the need to belong, researchers have looked at the influence of individual differences; in particular, interpersonal sensitivity and self-regulatory capacity.

Interpersonal sensitivity

A great deal of research has examined individual difference variables that relate to interpersonal sensitivity, such as social anxiety, anxious and avoidant attachment, rejection sensitivity, low self-esteem, and depressive symptoms. In general, researchers have argued that such insecurities make individuals hypervigilant for signs of rejection, leading to increased perceptions of rejection in others' behaviour, intense reactions in response to these perceptions, and an unwillingness to take risks in relationships (Dandeneau et al., 2008; Hale, Vander Valk, Akse, & Meeus, 2008; Lemay & Clark, 2008; Maner et al., 2007; Murray et al., 2008). These perceptions of rejection and accompanying intense reactions have a variety of negative consequences that make it harder for these individuals to maintain meaningful relationships and fulfil their need to belong. It has also been found that individuals who are high in fear of negative evaluation are less likely to try to affiliate after an experience of rejection (Maner et al., 2007) and expectations of rejection are also associated with increases in social anxiety and withdrawal (London, Downey, Bonica, & Paltin, 2007). It appears that individuals high in fear of negative evaluation are less likely to perceive others as a potential source of positive contact and may prioritize self-protection goals (e.g., avoiding dependence on a romantic partner) over seeking connection (Maner et al., 2007). A similar argument has been

made regarding people with low self-esteem. According to Murray et al. (2008), people with low self-esteem prioritize self-protection goals in close relationships. Because forming intimate, highly interdependent relationships that fulfil the need to belong requires emotional vulnerability and dependence, these self-protection goals can undermine satisfaction of belongingness needs. Murray et al. (2008) found that people with low self-esteem did not let go of self-protection goals even in long, established romantic relationships. Although goals for establishing connections to others are automatically, non-consciously activated in the face of threats to belonging for both high and low self-esteem people, only individuals with high self-esteem displayed a tendency to actually act on these connection goals. In contrast, low self-esteem people did not express a desire to increase connection in the face of threat. Instead, low self-esteem individuals were found to report lower feelings of closeness to their partners after facing social threat. These findings suggest that low self-esteem individuals prioritize self-protection goals in the face of rejection risk, overriding the automatically activated goals for seeking connection. This tendency of low self-esteem individuals to prioritize self-protection goals may result in lower levels of intimacy and strong difficulty in fully satisfying the need to belong (Murray et al., 2008). The theme of research on interpersonal sensitivity can be summarized as follows: sensitive individuals perceive a high degree of threat in relationships, which constrains their willingness to take interpersonal risks. However, this work arguably ignores the notion that people regulate social behaviour based not just on the potential for threat, but also on the opportunities for social rewards (MacDonald et al., 2009). Research suggests that perceptions of reward (i.e., potential for meaningful connection) and perceptions of threat (i.e., potential for being evaluated negatively) are statistically independent and have separate, reliable links with attachment insecurity (MacDonald et al., 2009). Specifically, whereas anxious attachment is strongly related to perceptions of high threat in social situations, avoidant attachment is related to perceptions of low opportunity for reward. MacDonald et al. (2009) argue that low reward perception is a defensive strategy of avoidant individuals that allows a consciously tolerable

excuse for bypassing social situations that provoke deeper fears of rejection. The cost of such a strategy, however, is likely to be a chronically unfulfilled need to belong. A related consideration is the nature of individuals' relational goals. The strength of an individual's social approach goals (a focus on acquiring positive relationship outcomes) and avoidance goals (a focus on avoiding negative relationship outcomes) has important implications for success in meeting the need to belong (Elliot, Gable, & Mapes, 2006). The distinction between approach and avoidance goals (as well as relational rewards and threats) is important because the absence of negative relationship events is not the same as the presence of positive relationship events (Elliot et al., 2006). Research shows that approach goals (e.g., wanting to increase intimacy) are positive predictors of relationship satisfaction in friendships, the frequency of positive relationship events, and subjective well-being, as well as negative predictors of feelings of loneliness and negative relationship events (Elliot et al., 2006). In contrast, avoidance goals (e.g., wanting to avoid losing the partner's interest) are positive predictors of loneliness, physical symptoms, and the frequency and impact of negative relationship events (Elliot et al., 2006). Because executing avoidance goals requires careful attention to signs of negative outcomes, avoidance goals may lead negative relationship events to be highly salient. This may then lead to a number of negative relationship behaviours, such as seeing threat in ambiguous behaviour and overreacting to signs of rejection from the partner, which may undermine relationship quality in the long term (Elliot et al., 2006). Given the negative relationship outcomes experienced by individuals who are high in interpersonal sensitivity, researchers have begun to examine interventions that may prevent negative relationship outcomes by reducing perceptions of threat. For example, Walton and Cohen (2007) found that minority students in universities experience particularly strong feelings of uncertainty about whether they belong and are accepted by others. These researchers attempted to normalize minority students' feelings of belonging uncertainty by telling them that such feelings of uncertainty are experienced by all new students, but that these feelings decrease over time. The intervention was successful, and minority students who received the

intervention rated their belongingness, self-efficacy, and academic potential more positively, engaged in more achievement behaviours, were affected less by daily experiences of adversity, and showed increases in GPA. These findings suggest that reducing doubts about belongingness can diminish the effects of events that might otherwise threaten one's belonging. Another study sought to reduce individuals' automatic vigilance for signs of rejection by having participants engage in a visual search task that required active inhibition of attention to rejecting faces (Dandeneau et al., 2008). After training, low self-esteem participants showed a decrease in rejection interference on a Stroop task (i.e., were better able to ignore rejection words) and a decrease in rejection bias in a visual probe task (i.e., were better able to ignore rejecting faces). The training also reduced students' feelings of stress about an upcoming exam regardless of self-esteem. Further, among a sample of telemarketers, rejection-desensitization training over a one-week period was associated with increases in self-esteem, decreases in stress levels, and lower cortisol release throughout the workday. These findings suggest that it may be possible to reduce automatic processing of rejection stimuli, which may be important for people who are high in interpersonal sensitivity.

LONG-TERM CONSEQUENCES OF A THWARTED NEED TO BELONG

Baumesiter and Leary (1995) argued that if belonging is a fundamental need, then ongoing thwarting of the need should lead to long-term negative outcomes. Many researchers have addressed this question and have found evidence that failure to meet one's need to belong is indeed related to a variety of negative consequences (Hames et al, 2015). For example, older adults who report higher levels of negative social interactions, such as rejection by others, have been found to report poorer health, more health conditions, and functional limitations over time (Newsom, Mahan, Rook, & Krause, 2008). In a study of university students, loneliness predicted enhanced sympathetic activity in the nervous system and higher levels of

total peripheral resistance (i.e., blood vessels that are less flexible), both of which may contribute to the development of high blood pressure (Hawkley, Burleson, Berntson, & Cacioppo, 2003). Loneliness was also related to higher stress and threat ratings, and predicted lower interaction positivity and higher interaction negativity (Hawkley et al., 2003). Despite lonely people's greater attention to social cues, it appears that some people who fail to meet their need to belong may have difficulty improving their situation. Loneliness and perceptions of others' behaviour as rejecting have been found to be relatively stable over time. For example, in one study 32% of the variance in negative social exchanges, including perceptions of rejection, was stable over a 2-year period (Newsom et al., 2008). Furthermore, the estimate of heritability for loneliness was 48% in a study of monozygotic and dizygotic twins, indicating high stability (Boomsma, Willemsen, Dolan, Hawkley, & Cacioppo, 2005). Therefore, it appears that not being able to meet one's need to belong has a variety of negative consequences that seem to be long term and possibly resistant to change. The consequences for aid workers of not achieving a degree of belonging in the community in which they live and work may extend beyond security risks. As cautioned several times in this chapter, we cannot necessarily draw any conclusions about belongingness among aid workers based on the results of laboratory experiments. In the absence of other belongingness research in the field of psychology however, I consider what these results might mean in the context of aid work. So, with a healthy amount of epistemological scepticism, it seems the research presented here suggests that there may be negative physiological and emotional consequences to such experiences, particularly if aid workers do not meet their need to belong in other ways, for example among other expats. The management of aid workers' health ought, then, to take into account these potentially serious effects. Organisations might consider providing opportunities for aid workers to develop a sense of belonging with groups other than the community, particularly if relationships with the community are strained. Maintaining strong ties with friends and families living elsewhere might be one way of doing this. However, more research on the negative effects of aid workers' thwarted attempts

to belong would be helpful in identifying whether and to what extent this effect occurs among aid workers.

CONCLUSION

Research on belonging as a need has proliferated since Baumeister and Leary's seminal paper in the 1990s, and many of the arguments forwarded by Baumeister and Leary (1995) have been confirmed by subsequent research. In particular, there is evidence that the need to belong has strong effects on people's cognitions, emotions, and behaviours, and a chronically unmet need may have negative consequences, which can profoundly affect an individual's life. However, there remain many inconsistencies in the evidence, and efforts thus far to resolve these issues have not succeeded.

One potential problem with some studies of belongingness, is their degree of validity and the extent to which methods of manipulating belonging in the lab really capture what it means to belong. For example, it seems being included or excluded from an electronic ball toss game, as has been used in several studies of belonging, may not truly reflect the real life experience of not belonging. Exclusion from a game, it could be argued, is a relatively temporary form of social exclusion, while the sense that one does not belong implies something rather more permanent and fundamental. Psychologists involved in these studies have themselves questioned the ecological validity of conducting belongingness research in a laboratory setting. It may be that the effects observed are a result of the artificial context in which most of these studies were conducted, rather than the nature of any underlying inherent need to belong, and may also account for the conflicting results observed.

Indeed, Discursive Psychology is part of the general movement of critical psychology, which developed, in part, as a reaction against the approaches of mainstream psychology, including the use of experiments to investigate human interaction (Billig, 2009). Critical psychologists argue there are several problems associated with using

an experimental paradigm to understand human behaviour. The first is that in the laboratory setting much real-world context is stripped from the interaction, and what context is available is frequently ignored in the write up of results. Discursive psychologists have observed that human action is situated, the context of which defines what is possible in a given interaction (Potter, 2003). That is, actions are situated within the here and now of unfolding conversation. They are located in the back-and-forth of conversational interaction, orienting to what has just happened and constructing an environment for what is possible in the remainder of the interaction (Potter, 2003). Another way in which interactions are situated is institutionally. Institutions, such as university psychology laboratories for example, are often accompanied by special identities which are pervasively relevant – scientist, patient, participant – such that actions will be understood in relation to those identities (Heritage & Clayman, 2010). Interactions in institutional settings often involve collections of local interactional goals that all parties orient to and as such the setting shapes what actions are possible (Potter, 2003). Behaviour observed in laboratory settings therefore is determinably shaped by occurring in that particular institutional setting, and cannot be generalised further than that.

Another reason critical psychologists have questioned the usefulness of experiments in understanding human interaction is that experimental psychologists typically adopt a Newtonian model of action, which assumes that one thing causes another (Billig, 2009). Experimental psychologists design experiments to test the effects of identified variables. If the experimenters find that subjects in the experimental group on average respond differently than subjects in the control group, it is claimed that the manipulated variable caused those differences. The underlying model is that changes in a particular variable causes a particular reaction.

Billig (2009) argues the model denies agency to the actor, ascribing it to the variable rather than the person. Billig (2009) further argues that experimentalists typically use styles of writing that reflect this model, and provides this example:

Arbitrary social categorization produced robust differences between in-group and out-group projection”, supporting the anchoring hypothesis by which “projection is

selectively engaged whenever a target group includes the self'' (Clement and Kruger, 2002, p. 225).

As Billig (2009) points out, the summary describes what social categorisation does – rather than what people do. Social categorisation has no agency and cannot do anything unless people (both experimental subjects and experimenters) engage in complex social actions and interactions within the experimental situation yet this is largely ignored in mainstream experimental psychology.

One common concern in discursive psychology has been to examine the way psychological terms are used in everyday conversation, and to use this to re-examine and re-specify the way psychologists understand psychological phenomena. For example, rather than studying how we remember, or what a memory is in the brain, discursive psychologists have investigated what people are doing when they claim to remember something in an interaction (Edwards, 1997; Middleton and Edwards, 1990; Middleton and Brown, 2005). Similarly Potter and Wetherell (1987) examined the concept of attitudes. In psychology, attitudes had traditionally been assumed to be the outward expression of a (relatively) stable inner stance. Through the analysis of conversation rather than experimental or survey data, Potter and Wetherell (1987) highlighted two troubling features for traditional work. First, when materials from outside the very constrained settings of forced choice attitude scales are examined, there is considerable variability. The same speaker seemingly offers different evaluations of the same thing in different contexts. Such variability is not explained by attitude research, and has largely been explained away as a problem of measurement tools. Second, although attitude research typically treats attitudes as hypothetical mental entities, they are constructed in interaction in terms of evaluative descriptions: words such as 'good' and 'bad' for example construct some element of the world in a negative or positive way. In traditional psychological study there is a clear cut separation between the object of the attitude and the attitudinal stance of the person – evaluative language is treated mainly as a medium accessing an individual's mental entities. Potter and Wetherell (1987) highlight the role of descriptions as constituting the attitudinal

object in particular ways. For instance, a speaker can produce a highly negative description of a minority group while claiming not to have negative attitudes about that group (Potter and Wetherell, 1988).

The aim of the research contained in this thesis, therefore, is to examine the way the practice of belonging is accounted; how it is made relevant, negotiated and achieved by participants through interaction. One potential limitation of the study described in this thesis, with regard to ecological validity, is the use of interview data, which, it could be argued, may not be reflective of belonging as it is practiced in genuine real-world interactions. On the other hand, it can be argued that interviews are (at times) 'natural' in that the interview setting is not necessarily consequential for accounts provided (Widdicombe & Wooffitt, 1995; Speer, 2002). The epistemological consequences of using interview data are discussed in more detail in the methodology chapter. However, regardless of our access to 'reality', the use of research interviews provides an important first step in looking at belonging in a wider context than the laboratory. It also renders visible the missing subject in traditional laboratory experiments conducted on belonging to date (Billet, 2007), as participants' accounts and constructions of belonging are foregrounded in comparison to those of the researcher.

As a result of this review, three broad research questions have emerged as particularly relevant to the advancement of our understanding of belonging, and to the use of belonging as a strategy in international aid work, which might usefully be investigated using a discursive psychological approach grounded in real-world interactions. These questions are i) how do aid workers account for and treat belonging in situ, ii) is belonging treated as a straightforward achievement in aid workers' accounts as it is in security literature and iii) how do aid workers interactionally manage fluctuations in belonging. In the following chapter I detail the methodology used in this study, before addressing the research questions in the remaining chapters.

Chapter 3: Methodology

Since the crisis in social psychology of the 1970s discursive approaches to psychological research have proliferated. So much so that the range of analyses grouped together under the umbrella term 'discourse analysis', differ in more ways than they are similar (Edwards, 1997). The various types of discursive analysis can be broadly categorised according to their epistemological approach; the so-called 'bottom up' approaches originally developed by Potter and Wetherell (1987), which focus on the micro processes of discourse; and the 'top down' approaches, which focus on wider discourses and how they relate to broad cultural and political contexts (Tuffin, 2005). Willig (2001) explained the bottom up approaches to discourse are often influenced by ethnomethodology and conversation analysis, in terms of focusing on the way in which meaning is negotiated in everyday contexts, and the social functions that are achieved in doing so. In contrast, the top down approaches tend to be influenced by poststructuralism and Michel Foucault (e.g., Foucault, 1980, 1990), thus focusing on how language is constitutive of social and cultural relations more generally. These fundamental differences between the two categories of discursive analysis have sparked debate in social psychology. In particular, Schegloff (1997, 1998, 1999) has argued in favour of bottom up approaches, particularly the use of conversation analysis, in terms of analysing the micro-processes with which people manage interactions, and has argued against drawing on wider cultural and contextual information in analysing discourse, describing it as a form of 'theoretical imperialism' (Schegloff, 1997, p. 167). In response, Billig (1999, p. 546) argued that conversation analysts already import a range of theoretical concepts into their analysis, and to ignore that constitutes

‘methodological and epistemological naivety’; that is, analytic concepts are being treated as merely read off the reality of the conversation rather than accepted as concepts that analysts bring to the data.

Discursive psychology (DP) emerged during the 1980s, as part of the turn toward discourse. Informed by ethnomethodology and conversation analysis, DP treats language as constitutive of reality, rather than as a neutral reflection of it (Edwards, 1997; Edwards & Potter, 1992; McKinlay & McVittie, 2008; Potter, 1996; Potter & Wetherell, 1987). This involves the application of methods for analysing text and talk as the topics of analysis in themselves, rather than as a route for coming to know a subject’s cognitions (Potter & Wetherell, 1987). This contrasts with mainstream social psychological methods that tend to rely on quantitative attitudinal surveys; treating language as a neutral vehicle for transporting the thoughts and cognitions of individuals (Rapley, 2001). These traditional methods have been criticised on the grounds that they assume it is possible to separate an attitude from the object that is being evaluated, whereas different ‘attitudes’ are argued to involve different constructions of the relevant ‘objects’ (Potter & Wetherell, 1987). In this regard, Reicher and Hopkins (1996a, 1996b, 2001) have illustrated that people do not simply respond to a pre-existing social reality, but are actively involved in the construction of social categories and contexts that create future-orientated social realities. In contrast, discursive approaches involve analysing discourse in terms of the social functions it performs, such as the way that particular narrative structures, rhetorical devices, uses of categories and ways of describing serve particular ends by justifying or criticising certain actions or states of affairs (Potter & Wetherell, 1987; Edwards & Potter, 1992; McKinlay & McVittie, 2008).

Use of Interview Data

The research detailed in this thesis was conducted using interviews. Use of interview data in discursive research has been the topic of some contention among analysts adhering to the ‘top-down’ approaches outlined above; for example,

conversation analysis and discursive psychology. Analysts in these disciplines have expressed 'dispreference' (ten Have, 2002) for what they argue is pre-arranged, set up and contrived data (Speer, 2002, ten Have, 2002). They favour naturally occurring data in which everyday conversations are recorded as they happen; that is, data that has not been elicited by the researcher for the purposes of research (Potter, 2002; 2004). While this was originally a particular concern for conversation analysts, and is even sometimes built into definitions of conversation analysis (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998), analysts in other discursive traditions have adopted this approach. One of the founding proponents of discursive psychology, Jonathan Potter, now argues in favour of naturalistic data despite his early work drawing heavily on interview data. In an article published in 2005, Potter and Hepburn outline the problems they perceive for most interview data in the social sciences, which are

the flooding of the interview with social science agendas and categories; the complex and varying footing positions of interviewer and interviewee; the orientations to stake and interest on the part of the interviewer and interviewee; the reproduction of cognitivism (Potter & Hepburn, 2005, p. 281)

They conclude that given these problems are so pervasive researchers are better to avoid using interviews altogether, except in some circumstances in which interviews are the only way to gather data, for example on certain topics.

In the same issue of the journal in which Potter and Hepburn's article was published Smith, Hollway and Mishler (2005) provided a rebuttal. They point out that the critique is problematic because it advocates a particular type of qualitative analysis; conversation analysis, and as such the recommendations only apply to certain types of studies. Smith et al (2005) query Potter and Hepburn's assertion that interviewers 'flood' the interview with social science concepts' arguing they do so only if intended (e.g., to investigate how people talk about 'attitudes') or when poorly designed or conducted. They also argue issues of footing, stake and interest are not unique to interview situations, but rather found in all interactional settings, and therefore remain interesting topics for analysis in both interview data and

naturalistic data. Smith et al suggest Potter et al treat transcription as a-theoretical, and that this is problematic because, they claim, all forms of data collection carry theoretical assumptions about the object of their analysis, and therefore there can be no one ideal system for transcription. Hutchby and Wooffitt (1998) point out that it is impossible to capture all the details of conversations in transcripts. This would, for a start, make transcriptions impossible to read. Decisions about which features are to be included are made, in part, on the basis of theoretical ideas about which features of talk are relevant for the organisation of conversations. Hence, transcripts are not neutral, theory-free representations of conversations (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998). This point is further developed in Goodman and Burke (2010) who argue the distinction between natural and contrived data is artificial because 'talk is always simultaneously both 'natural': as speakers produce their own accounts, and 'contrived': as speakers are always attending to a particular social situation'. However, despite these limitations and the possibility that no data can be truly objective once collected, the consensus in support of naturally occurring data as preferable to that generated by research is supported by many practitioners of discursive analysis for the reasons outlined above.

With the above critiques in mind, I argue my reliance on interview data in this thesis is, though, both defensible and justified for several reasons, which I outline below. First, the desire to avoid an undesirable bias due to the presence of the researcher by collecting naturalistic data, appears to reflect a problematic empiricist ideal of 'direct access' (Atkinson & Heritage, 1984, p. 2-3) to phenomena for example Potter's (2004a) claim that naturalistic data enable the analyst to start with 'what is there'. This ideal of unbiased, direct access is arguably unattainable, in part because of the selective nature of recording and transcription, explained in the paragraph above (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998). Furthermore, appeals to 'what is there' seem incongruent with the stance of many discourse analysts, like Potter, who frequently adopt a relativistic epistemological approach (Edwards & Potter, 2003; Edwards, Ashmore & Potter, 1995; Potter, 1992; Potter, 1996). Moreover, the focus on the

sequential organisation of talk makes the influence of the interviewer's turns analysable and explicit, and therefore not invisible as Potter and Hepburn (2005) have claimed. However, despite these limitations and the possibility that no data can be truly objective once collected, the consensus in support of naturally occurring data as preferable to that generated by research is supported by many practitioners of discursive analysis for the reasons outlined above. Second, as Potter and Hepburn (2005) acknowledge, obtaining naturally occurring talk may be prohibitively difficult for some topics or situations. Recording international aid workers' conversations would be very costly, involving travel to several international locations and staying for a period of time during which the data would be collected. By using interviews over skype, I avoided this cost. Third, as discussed in the paragraph above, the distinction between natural and contrived data is arguably artificial given that, for example, in many cases the collection of 'natural' recordings involve obtaining informed consent from participants, therefore participants are aware that what they say may be recorded, transcribed and analysed for social research purposes. To argue that this constitutes entirely natural data is to assume that participants are not producing accounts designed for both the person with whom they are interacting and the researcher they know will be listening to the interaction later. On the other hand, it can be argued that interviews are (at times) 'natural' interactions in that the interview setting is not necessarily consequential for accounts provided in interactions (Widdicombe & Wooffitt, 1995; Speer, 2002). One of the central conversation analytic principles is procedural consequentiality (Schegloff, 1991; 1992): contextual features should only be taken into account when it is observable that, and in what way, conversation partners design their talk according to certain contextual features. Thus, as Widdicombe and Wooffitt (1995) propose, interview data should be treated as 'ordinary' informal conversations, unless it is observable that and how respondents attend to the situation as 'being in an interview'.

In the research contained in this thesis, therefore, I adopt Widdicombe and Wooffitt's (1995) approach to interviews. They suggest interviews should be seen as

a useful way to elicit people's accounting practices, in which they engage their culturally shared, reasoning practices. Most of the interviews I conducted were done using Skype, a brand of free internet calling software, because participants were located in many places across the globe and my budget did not stretch to travelling to each to conduct interviews. Below I discuss the use of this relatively new technology for social research interviews.

Use of Internet Calling Software

The use of internet calling software in research interviews is a relatively recent development in the social sciences. At the time I conducted my interviews a search of the literature revealed just one published comment on the use of skype for research interviews. By the time I submitted this thesis however, several years later, the same search turned up well over a page of relevant results on google.scholar.com.

When using Skype to interview in place of face-to-face or telephone interviewing, there is no alteration in theoretical framework of the study, nor are the typical processes of consent, engagement, and questioning generally altered. Interviewing has been described as a craft (Kvale, 2009), and if this is so using Skype or a similar alternative is simply one more tool available to researchers practicing that craft. Scholars have suggested there have been "moments in the history of qualitative research," at which technological changes have advanced the discipline (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011) and recently the use of internet calling software has been heralded as another such moment (Onwuegbuzie, Leech, & Collins, 2010). Although the research into this new technology for interviewing is currently very limited, the consensus among studies that have been conducted is generally, as Sullivan (2012 p 59) puts it, that "the benefits definitely outweigh the drawbacks" (see Deakin & Wakefield, 2013; Hanna, 2012; Janghorban, Roudsari, & Taghipour, 2013). In the following section, I detail the specific methods and procedures used for the collection of my data.

EMPIRICAL PROCESS

Pilot Study

Data for this thesis was collected for both a pilot and main study. The pilot study was conducted in April and May 2011, with eight participants. All aspects of the pilot were the same as for the main study with the exception of some of the questions; which were refined through the course of the pilot. Ethics approval, recruitment of participants and the methodology remained the same between the two studies, for more details please see the relevant sections below.

The aims of the pilot study were twofold:

- a) To ascertain whether and to what extent it was possible to conduct effective, semi-structured interviews with aid workers using the medium of internet voice calling software such as skype. At the time that this study was conducted a search of the literature did not turn up any other study conducted by internet calling software so a pilot study was used to test the feasibility of this new and relatively unfamiliar interview tool. Because of the absence of skype-specific research precedents I used literature on telephone interviewing to inform the structure and development of the interview process.
- b) To develop a rough understanding of the kinds of issues that arise in the talk of aid and development workers in a research interview. This information was sought in order to guide the eventual interview questions and focus of the thesis. As mentioned in the section above, this inductive approach is informed by the ideal of ethnomethodological indifference advocated by Schegloff and widely practised among conversational analysts. Although the type used in the production of this thesis is not as complete as that of Schegloff's, a degree of openness and an investment in an inductive approach to the data was been used.

It was found that skype worked well as a medium through which to conduct social psychological interviews and that international humanitarian workers spoke eagerly, and in ways that seemed typical of social research interviews, about their experiences living and working in communities other than their own. Based on the results of the pilot study it was decided that skype would be used in the main study as planned.

Main Study

Data Collection, Participants and Interviews

Data was collected through interviews with 25 international aid workers between May 2011 and August 2012. The interviews were semi-structured, so that similar questions could be asked across different participants while also allowing for prompts, probes and follow-up questions in order to elicit more detail on particular issues. This also provided flexibility in the ordering of questions so as to make the discussion flow more naturally. All but three interviews, which were conducted in person, were completed using skype. Interviews generally took between 40 and 60 minutes, with the longest and shortest interviews being 75 minutes and 30 minutes respectively.

Audio from the interviews was recorded using free web-based voice recording software called Audacity. Webcams were not used, therefore there was no visual data to be collected. This decision was made as a result of experiences in the pilot study in which I turned on my webcam before placing the call to each participant. However, after the first three interviews in which participants chose not to turn on their own webcams without explanation, I turned mine off for the remaining interviews. There may be several reasons why the first participants did not turn on their web cams. Perhaps because I did not suggest it, or because they found it easier or more anonymous to speak without video. Alternatively, it is possible participants, often located in remote areas of the globe, were not able to use the

video feature because of the limited capacity of local internet connections, which can make video calls much less reliable and of poorer quality than audio calls.

Interestingly none of the participants commented on either the presence or lack of video in the interviews. And as a point of self-reflection, as an interviewer, my sense was it was not a matter that could be comfortably broached, and so I did not bring the issue up myself either.

Data was stored electronically in two file formats in two locations. Both locations were password protected and data storage adhered to best practice guidelines published by the University of Edinburgh. Demographic details were not collected from participants; given they would not be used in the analysis.

Recruitment

Participants were recruited through advertisements placed on Reliefweb.net; the main website on which international aid and development vacancies and volunteer opportunities are advertised. All major and many minor international non-government agencies (INGOs) and United Nations departments advertise vacancies on this website. The advertisement was placed as a non-paid volunteer activity, and billed as “an opportunity to help shape the future of humanitarian work”. A description of the research was included in the body of the advertisement, and both the information sheet and consent sheet were attached. The advertisement was replaced three times over the course of 16 months in order to generate further responses. Respondents were asked to express interest in participating by email, and encouraged to ask questions. A small proportion of respondents, four in total, dropped out after discovering they had misread the advertisement and the interview was not paid. One participant declined to take part after initially expressing interest because she felt “uncomfortable about the nature of the research”.

Participants worked or had worked for a broad range of organisations and over a large geographical area. Most participants had worked for several organisations and in several locations.

Ethical Considerations

Ethical approval for the study was granted by the University of Edinburgh Psychology Ethics Committee (granted in May 2011). All participants were provided with an information sheet about the study via email before the interview, and encouraged to read it. They were also provided a consent sheet which they were asked to read and sign, or provide verbal consent at the beginning of the interview. Verbal consent was always recorded and is included in interview transcripts. For a copy of the information sheet and consent form please see appendixes A and B. Participants were informed the interviews were voluntary and confidential and that they had the right to withdraw at any point. They were also assured their names would not appear in the research or any subsequent publication, and that any details that might identify them, or someone else, would be altered or omitted in order to preserve confidentiality and anonymity.

Data Analysis

There are a number of documented processes to analysing discourse, although some have argued the full process evades description as it is more like a subconscious skill akin to riding a bike (Potter, 2004). Within discursive psychology however, Potter and Wetherell (1987) outline a three-step process entailing transcribing, coding and analysis; I followed roughly this framework in analysing my data. In the initial stage I transcribed the data to a course level, which included all utterances – including for example repairs, part words and false starts – as well as other features such as length of pauses, laughter and obvious changes in intonation. Those extracts chosen for more detailed analysis and presentation in the thesis were transcribed to a more detailed level, following some of the conventions described by Jefferson

(2004) and widely used within discourse analysis (appendix C). As discussed earlier in this chapter the transcription process is theory laden because it involves decisions about what counts as important aspects of the data, and should therefore be considered a crucial part of the analytic process (Hammersley, 2010; Mishler, 2005). The second stage involved reading through the transcripts at a 'high level' and carrying out provisional coding. This coding was based on a combination of the content and form of accounts, or the actions which they seemed to perform. I grouped together these codes in data sets, based on the content of the themes addressed in the extracts, such as 'clothing and dress', 'security' and 'acceptance'. Note that although my main focus was on actions performed by participants, I noticed that certain actions tended to occur when particular topics were discussed, and so content became an organisational principle in the analysis. The final stage involved a closer reading of the extracts in their respective themes to look at whether and what kinds of work were being done by participants in the extracts, and then grouping them according to those actions. Selection of extracts for further analysis was informed by my theoretical interests, and by my impression that some particularly interesting interactional or interpersonal business was being done. In the third stage, when the final analysis was conducted, I adhered as closely as possible to discursive psychological principles of data analysis. DP is data-driven, and based as much as is possible, on participants' understandings and orientations rather than those of the analyst. Hence, I refrained from making a priori assumptions about the relevance of analytical theories and categories, such as for instance participants' motivations, demographic variables (e.g. class or age), or other theoretical concepts and contextual information (Antaki & Widdicombe, 1998; Heritage, 1984, Ten Have, 1999; Potter, 2004). I also focussed on sequences of utterances, rather than isolated utterances. This is necessary because the meaning of utterances and the actions they perform are considered dependent on their sequential context. In addition, participants continuously and inevitably display their understandings of previous turns in their utterances (Stivers & Heritage, 2001; Antaki & Widdicombe, 1998). Hence, a focus on sequences and understandings

displayed therein, is a useful tool for the validation of analytic claims regarding the meaning and function of statements (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998; Potter, 2004; Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson, 1974). It is what Hutchby and Wooffitt (1998, p. 729) term the 'next-turn proof procedure'.

I also found a number of tools detailed in de Kok (2006) useful in conducting my analysis. The first of which was looking beyond patterns to variability in content and design of statements both between and within interviews. As Potter and Wetherell (1987) argue, the selection of one description rather than another is based on the function that a certain description can fulfil at a particular point in the conversation – Schegloff's 'right' utterance. Therefore, variability is a valuable tool with which to gain insight into the functions of descriptions (Potter, 2004a). The second tool de Kok (2006) recommends is asking questions of the data (Madill, Widdicombe & Barkham, 2001), such as 'what is this participant doing in this turn?' (Pomerantz & Fehr, 1998) 'why this (utterance/phrase/action) now?' (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998; Wong & Olsher, 2000) and 'to what interactional, interpersonal problem is this statement a solution?' (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998). Doing so provides a structure through which to read the interview data, and a way 'in' to extracts when participants' actions do not appear obvious.

A third tool I used was to pay particular attention to deviant cases. As several authors have pointed out, if one or a couple of cases do not fit with an analytic claim, the claim needs to be adjusted in such a way that it can include these anomalies as well (Potter, 2004; Potter & Wetherell, 1987; Willig, 2001). On the other hand, if one can show that certain features of the extracts make that they are recognizably different from the 'average' extract, this strengthens the analytic claim (Potter & Wetherell, 1987). This is especially so if one can show that the participants orient to the anomalous nature of the interaction (Potter, 2004). And the final tool used to refine my analysis, was to discuss my ideas with supervisors and with colleagues at the Postgraduate Psychology and Discourse Group (PoPDoG) and Scottish Ethnomethodology, Discourse, Interaction & Talk (SEdit) Group.

The final extracts presented in the thesis were selected for a number of reasons. When choosing between two extracts I generally chose the extract in which the action performed was done most succinctly – that is over the least number of lines. This was purely for reasons of space and ease of reading. At other times extracts were chosen because they were the clearest typical examples of participants' responses or because of their contribution to the analytic story being told. Below I address two aspects of my study design that required additional thought, research and discussion with colleagues because they were both not typical of qualitative psychological research at the time.

SUMMARY

In this chapter, I have made a case for the use of discursive psychology for the study of belonging among aid workers. Discursive psychology provides a framework for examining belonging as a practice, which, as was outlined in the previous chapter, has not yet been looked at in academic literature. I have made a case for the use of interviews, rather than 'naturally occurring data'. I have addressed the potential limitations of using internet calling software to conduct research interviews, arguing that while this method may lack some of the additional non-verbal cues available in face-to-face interviews, this is not terminal to the research and may indeed be preferable given the invisibility of non-verbal communication in transcriptions. I have also argued that although my sample size is not large compared with some other qualitative interview based studies, it is adequate for the discursive psychological analysis of talk-in-interaction. In the next chapter I present the first of my analytical findings, which were developed using the methods detailed in the current chapter.

Chapter 4: Belonging in Local Communities

As discussed in the introduction, belonging is widely believed to be an important aspect of establishing and maintaining security, both for aid workers as individuals and for the organisation. In this chapter I examine participants' accounts of belonging in the communities in which they work. I investigate how belonging was treated in the interviews and the kind of interactional work done by participants in the service of conversational goals related to belonging. When an aid worker arrives in a location to which they have been posted, they may not know anyone. They typically arrive from the main city, into which they flew a couple of days beforehand, with just a bag to begin work. The duration of their contract there may be as little as three months, or as long as several years. They may have little or no connection to their new home, and so the task of establishing a degree of belonging can be challenging. As outlined in the introduction, aid workers must achieve some level of acceptance in the local community, for security reasons, but they must also do so in order to facilitate their daily lives. Aid workers need to shop in the market, use the roads and checkpoints, and engage the services of local businesses. There is also a shared wisdom in the aid industry that closer relations between 'foreign' aid workers and locals improves the quality of work that aid agencies do in that location. Indeed, international non-government organisations (INGOs) are frequently criticised for failing to adequately engage with local communities. It is sometimes proposed that INGOs' attachment to the principles of impartiality and independence, the growing size of projects, the political and security contexts, and the greater focus on the 'technical dimension' to the detriment of the 'human dimension', have made achieving belonging in a given community increasingly difficult for aid workers (Chevalier, 2001). In one of the very few studies to have been conducted on friendships between aid workers and locals Eric Heuser (2012)

published results of an ethnographic study conducted in Indonesia. He showed that friendships with the local population act as “mediators” (p 1,428) between different levels of social engagement, impacting on the effectiveness of their work. He found that social interaction between aid workers and the local people among whom they live and work, frequently moved beyond the private to the professional acting as meaningful resources for development work. These findings add further weight to claims that closer relationships between aid workers and local residents result in better aid outcomes.

Belonging in local communities was discussed in every interview, if it was not made relevant by the participant, the interviewer asked about it. Participants handled this discussion in particular ways, and in this chapter I examine two major themes in talk of belonging in relation to local communities. The first is participant’s treatment of belonging as a practice for which they are accountable, and the second concerns participants linking belonging with identity.

The extracts analysed in this chapter were selected from parts of the interviews in which participants discussed local communities and their experiences of belonging. Talk about belonging in the interviews was both volunteered and prompted. As might be expected, prompted disclosures were done in turns that answered direct questions about the degree to which, or whether participants felt accepted by local communities; and volunteered disclosures were either formulated in response to a question about something other than belonging – for example the challenges of working in the field - or embedded in other narrative description. The extracts in this chapter were selected because they contained discussion of belonging in relation to the local community, and because they worked as exemplars of features found in several extracts.

BELONGING AS AN ACCOUNTABLE PRACTICE

In the first extract below, the interviewer does not ask about belonging, instead the participant, Rose, makes this relevant in her answer about the challenges of working in the field as an aid worker. The interviewer's question is provided in italics and occurs several turns before Rose's eventual response below. The intervening includes clarification of the question and a complaint about the quality of the internet connection.

Extract 1

Question: Ok, gosh quite a bit of experience then, that's great. So could you tell me, thinking back to when you've gone and worked in the field (.) can you tell me about what some of the main challenges are, in working in the field?

- 1 Rose: Even if I always try to um know as much as I can about the country
- 2 the culture, to to not really to integrate because you you are always external
- 3 but, um I try to know as much as I can about the country and people and so
- 4 to um yeah let's say to integrate in place where I am. But uh I think that its
- 5 normal and its inherent in being a foreigner but uh you can try as much as
- 6 you want, you are always external and especially with this kind of work
- 7 where you are deployed for one year or maybe two or even less you don't
- 8 have the time to really become part of the place where you where you were.

Rose begins her response to the interviewer's question by describing her efforts to "integrate in the place where I am" (line 4). Although she does not use the term belonging, Rose's references to being "external" (lines 6); "integrat(ing)" (line 4) and "becom(ing) part of the place where you were" (line 8) can be heard as references to belonging. Rose constructs her response as an account of what she routinely does (Edwards, 1994) when living in places to which she is deployed. She formulates these activities as effortful through repeated use of the word 'trying' (de Kok & Widdicombe, 2008) "I try to know as much as I can" (line 3), "I always try" (line 1) and "you can try as much as you want" (lines 5-6). In this context the 'try' constructs her and other aid workers' endeavours to achieve belonging as effortful, even if not necessarily successful. This works to moderate accountability for her position as

'external', by presenting it as persisting despite her best efforts rather than because of a lack of trying.

The extreme case formulation (Pomerantz, 1986) "you are always external" makes being an outsider and not belonging an unchangeable reality. It highlights the immutability or temporal consistency of aid workers' status as external and suggests that efforts to integrate are futile. Through the use of the verb 'trying' and extreme case formulations Rose has constructed a conversational landscape in which her effortful trying is pitted against a fixed and unchanging reality in which aid workers are always external. Attempts to fit in are cast as futile because of the nature of realities beyond her control; she is a "foreigner" (line 5) and is only deployed for a short period of time; "one year or maybe two" (line 7).

Rose builds immunity to any potential accusation that her not having achieved belonging might be unique to her experience by characterising 'not belonging' as normal and expected. Rose starts by describing her trying in line one in the first person "I always try to um know as much as I can about the country the culture", then switches to third person at line two as she produces a stance about not belonging "you are always external". At line three "I try to know as much as I can about the country and people and so to um yeah let's say to integrate in place where I am" is contrasted with the remainder of the extract from line four onwards, about not fitting in, which is formulated in the third person

you can try as much as you want, you are always external and especially with this kind of work where you are deployed for one year or maybe two or even less you don't have the time to really become part of the place where you where you were
(lines 4-7)

Switching from the first to the third person narrative works to manage accountability by constructing trying to belong as something she personally does which may or may not be unique to her, but failure to belong as universal and

common to all aid workers. The use of the third person narrative 'you', also works as a scripted formulation to present not belonging as something expected and, in Rose's own words "normal" (line 4) (Edwards, 1994).

In this extract Rose treats belonging as a project for which aid workers might be held accountable, and works to divest herself of accountability for not achieving belonging by constructing herself as a conscientious 'tryer'. She further builds immunity against accountability for fitting in by formulating the project of belonging as ultimately futile given certain fixed realities about aid workers; they are foreign and therefore always external.

In contrast to Extract 1, in which the participant makes relevant belonging in the local community, in extract two below, the interviewer asks the participant directly about being accepted in the community.

Extract 2

- 1 I: And so do you feel that you were reasonably well accepted by your
2 local community?
3 Maria: Yeah it d (.) again it depends on the country (.) um I think that the two
4 tiered sort of pay_ment scale can be difficult (.) when local staff is getting
5 paid less than expat staff that sets up (..) um (..) some friction among the staff
6 (.) and in other cases when (...) yeah in in one case in particular I found that I
7 had a really easy time adjusting tuh the local life (.) I was only there for three
8 months but I sort of really immediately made friends with my colleagues and
9 it was very (.) a very small office and a very welcoming environment and I
10 really do feel like (..) like I had an easy adjustment and was accepted
11 I: Ok and so what do you think that depended on? Was that because of
12 something that you (.) did yourself (.) or or (..) entirely the context or
13 Maria: Huh (.) I think that my (..) I always try to approach the local
14 community and integrate myself um I think to the same extent (.) its hard to
15 say but I think that the sort of culture of the office the culture of a country or
16 region has a lot to do with how easily foreigners especially (.) um especially
17 whites are accepted

The interviewer's question is formulated in such a way that it projects a preferred response; the question invites agreement "and so do you feel that you were reasonably well accepted by your local community?". Maria's "yeah it d (.)" at line three indicates that she treats the interviewer's question as such, and her upcoming stance as a dispreferred response. Pomerantz (1986) has shown that delayed responses beginning with 'well', or in this case 'yeah', and pauses, as observed here, are common features of interactionally sensitive or dispreferred responses. By beginning her turn with "yeah it d (.)" Maria orients to acceptance in the local community as an interactionally delicate matter, and the remainder of her response attends to this dilemma through careful management of accountability.

In answer to the interviewer's question Maria constructs a turn in which she produces a stance, elaboration, an up shot and finally evidence in support of her stance. At line three Maria produces a stance about employment conditions for locals compared with expat staff "um I think that the two tiered sort of pay_ment scale can be difficult". She goes on to elaborate on that stance by explaining that local staff are paid less than expat staff. She produces an up shot at line five "that sets up (..) um (..) some friction among the staff" and then provides supporting evidence for her stance by way of an example of a posting in which she was accepted "yeah in in one case in particular I found that I had a really easy time adjusting tuh the local life" (lines 6-7). At the beginning of Maria's turn we learn that achieving belonging "depends on the country" (line 3) and whether a "two-tiered pay_ment scale" (line 3-4) is in place, now Maria adds "a very small office and a very welcoming environment" (line 9) facilitate being accepted. In her response to the interviewer's question Maria treats belonging as dependent on several factors, each of which is contextual rather than personal. This formulation ultimately works to make available the assumption that achieving belonging is not something for which Maria, or other aid workers, can be held accountable.

The interviewers' question at lines 11-12 shows that she orients to this issue of accountability in Maria's response; offering two potential accounts for why Maria was accepted: "something that you (.) did yourself (.) or or (..) entirely the context or" (lines 11-12). In response, and using the same formulation as Rose in Extract 1, Maria constructs herself as an effortful 'tryer' using an extreme case formulation "I always try" at line 13. And like Rose, Maria's 'trying' is situated in a landscape characterised by obstacles to acceptance, which for her is "the sort of culture of the office the culture of a country or region" (lines 15-16) which has "a lot to do with how easily foreigners especially (.) um especially whites are accepted" (lines 16-17). Maria's use of 'culture' in accounting for her acceptance in a community shows that she orients to the implications associated with placing blame for not being accepted on local people; or in other words producing a negative assessment of them. Negative assessments of the very people one is there to help, generally people poorer with fewer access to resources, is understandably problematic and Maria works to overcome this by referring, instead, to culture. McHoul (2004, p.438) argues that references to culture can be used to displace personal responsibility: "imbrication in 'a culture' can become a defence in its own right", by making someone into a "mere member of a larger constituency of wrong-doers". However this is not an untroubled claim and there are several indications this might be problematic for Maria in this context. In line 14 Maria prefaces her point with "I think" then "it's hard to say" and then further along "I think" again, in so doing she moderates or makes conditional the forthcoming claim by minimising the strength of her conviction; she 'thinks' rather than 'knows', and its 'hard to say' rather than, for example, 'plain to see'

Maria works to avoid accountability for not being accepted by making belonging dependent on several contextual factors: the country, a two-tiered payment scale, the nature of the office and local culture. In so doing Maria makes achieving belonging a project largely out of her control while avoiding the potential interactional consequences of placing blame in problematic places – on beneficiaries.

In Extract 3 below, Bahir answers a question about local people's perceptions of aid workers. He recruits some of the same conversational tools as Rose and Maria, while introducing another, which we see used in later extracts.

Extract 3

- 1 I: No, yeah, ok. Um and s-so what do you um view as o how do you
2 think that the local population viewed the aid workers or the
3 humanitarian workers that were there?
- 4 Bahir: Ah it its funny I was just looking what's going on in London today or
5 in the UK and we had similar things happen in Vancouver not long
6 ago in terms of a riot. Um I-I think that they you know comparing that
7 to our social systems here they were looking at us as their social
8 welfare system um, they were looking at us as their handouts and
9 that's the UN creates that the UN goes in and creates a hand out
10 system you don't create the um, they try to but they're not successful
11 at creating the process of um, you know the fisherman that you feed
12 fish as opposed to giving the fishing rod the analogy (inaudible) it was
13 more of a 'here you go here's your food for today we'll see you
14 tomorrow'. Back in line again.
- 15 I: Yeah
- 16 Bahir: So I a the locals through the market constantly 'you're UN you're UN
17 um you have money can we get some money', ah constant...

Although, belonging is not explicitly referred to in this extract, it has been included for analysis because the topic of the question: local people's perceptions of aid workers, is related to notions of aid workers' belonging in local communities.

Like Maria in Extract 2, Bahir signals that the interviewer's question touches on an interactionally sensitive matter by beginning his response with "Ah it its funny" which works to hedge his coming statement and mirrors Pomerantz's (1986) example "you might think this is a funny thing to say". It also functions to suggest a link between the topic of the question and his forthcoming reference to the riots (lines 5-6) – an adjoiner for two subjects that might, in this context, otherwise seem unrelated. Bahir's "I was just", which immediately follows, formulates what he is about to recount as both a coincidence and as predating the interviewer's question;

as something current and 'live' for him. Bahir's response then takes on a similar structure to Maria's in which he produces a stance, makes an attribution of accountability, evidences this claim and finishes with an upshot.

At line four Bahir produces a stance about local people

they were looking at us as their social welfare system um, they were looking at us as their handouts (Lines 7-8)

His stance is followed immediately by an attribution of accountability in which he places responsibility for Sudanese reliance on handouts on the UN: "and that's the UN creates that, the UN goes in and creates a handout system". Bahir buttresses his claim by offering evidence using two devices. The first is an idiomatic reference at line 10 "you know the fisherman that you feed fish as opposed to giving the fishing rod the analogy" which Bahir treats as shared knowledge because he begins his claim with "you know" and provides only enough detail for the listener to recognise the allusion. The second device used is reported speech at lines 12-13 "'here you go here's your food for today we'll see you tomorrow'" and at lines 15-16 "you're UN you're UN um you have money can we get some money". In this context reported speech works to lend a conversational claim greater authority as an accurate account of what occurred (Coulmas, 1986; Holt, 1996).

Bahir, like Maria and Rose above, treats aid workers' position among local people as both an interactionally sensitive and accountable matter. In constructing this account, like Maria, Bahir works to manage the potential conversational pitfalls of negative assessments of local people. He does this in two ways; first, by equating the handouts with the social welfare system in Canada he makes available the assumption that Sudanese are not unique in their reliance on humanitarian assistance. Second, by making their reliance on handouts a function of the failings of the UN rather than any other factor - for example personal or community failings - Bahir avoids making negative assessments of local people.

In extract four below, the participant, Habib, makes belonging relevant in his answer to another question. He recruits similar conversational devices to the earlier participants, in order to mitigate the potential interactional consequences of producing negative characterisations of local people.

Extract 4

- 1 I: Ihim (0.7) so um: tsi (0.2) I wonder (.) are you (.) do you find (.)
 2 that its easier to be some- (0.1) accepted in some places and
 3 harder in others or (0.5) what has your experience been there?
 4 (1.5)
 5 Habib: Oh well (.) eh I can say (0.2) that you can be accepted anywhere
 6 (0.1) but (0.2) thē strategies that you have to use (0.6) can be
 7 more elaborated in one place and (0.3) less elaborated (0.3) in
 8 other places
 9 I: Hm (0.4) [s so
 10 Habib: yeh]
 11 I: =sorry carry on himh
 12 Habib: Ye yeahm and so:: ah: (3.0) →yeah some culture they can
 13 accept (1.0) for example in Haiti it was really really difficult (0.8) uh to
 14 be accepted (0.4) uh:: because I felt that uh the people have uhm
 15 (1.0) #uh: (2.0) I don't know but uh (0.6) they wanted (.) to make
 16 sure that (.) they are the only one that (.) they know how (.)
 17 things work in Haiti (0.4) and all the people who came from:
 18 outside during the emergency (0.6) it was of course (0.1) it was
 19 (0.3) something overwhelming for all (0.2) suddenly in two
 20 hour (0.1) and (0.1) two days (0.3) uh: \$people \$wehre
 21 \$invhahding \$this \$uh (0.1) you know (0.1) humanitarians were
 22 invading this country
 23 I: Hm
 24 Habib: Uhm (0.3) so: (0.2) that was really (0.1) really challenging uh
 25 (0.3) in that sense (0.2) ehm (0.2) so ah (0.6) I I I stayed for three
 26 months there and I I still don't feel that I was accepted by hah
 27 ihany of the people I worked with it was (.) it was ah (.) a daily
 28 challenge just to uh (0.8) ah (0.6) you know convince them (0.2)
 29 with a new (0.1) point of view: (0.3) convince them of a new
 30 (0.2) way to work (1.0) they always had: (0.6) uh: (0.3) this:
 31 feeling that (0.2) 'no you don't know we (0.3) we know how to

32 deal with the things'(0.5) even if I'm (0.1) bringing uhm (0.5) uh
 33 experiences from outside but (0.6) but at least in the first three
 34 months uh (0.2) after the emergency in Haiti (.) it was (0.2) that
 35 was a challenge.
 36 I: Ihim
 37 Habib: But it's also I think uh (0.6) because the people were: (0.2) you
 38 know had (.) really harsh (0.4) eh even the people that we were
 39 working with they had (0.2) they lost maybe (.) someone lost
 40 the family's: (0.5) houses and stuff so: (0.4) so the whole:e uh
 41 (0.5) uh e energy around (0.2) eh the place it was (0.2) it was
 42 extremely negative in the in the beginning

In the above extract Habib produces a series of stances in reply to the interviewer's initial question, which he then works to moderate in particular ways. Like those extracts above, Habib's constructions follow a basic formula: they begin with a stance, followed by an elaboration, then an attribution of blame or an explanation and finally an upshot. His use of this formula is outlined below.

Habib produces his first stance at line five

Oh well (.) eh I can say (0.2) that you can be accepted anywhere (0.1) but (0.2) the strategies that you have to use (0.6) can be more elaborated in one place and (0.3) less elaborated (0.3) in other places

This response is influenced by the interviewer's question which, because of its formulation, projects a particular answer. The question takes for granted that acceptance is possible, querying only the ease with which it is achieved "do you find (.) that it's easier to be some- (0.1) accepted in some places and harder in others" (line 1-3). Habib begins with "oh well" indicating that he treats his upcoming stance as a dispreferred response, going on to make acceptance possible but dependent on using an appropriate strategy for the context. Habib elaborates on his claim about being accepted by producing an account of a place, Haiti, in which "it was really really difficult (0.8) uh to be accepted" (lines 12-13) and why that was

the case; “because I felt that uh the people have uhm (1.0) uh: (2.0) I don’t know but uh (0.6) they wanted (.) to make sure that (.) they are the only one that (.) they know how (.) things work in Haiti” (lines 14-16). His elaboration contains a claim about what local people are like, which is hearable as negative. Almost immediately following this Habib produces a sympathetic account of why residents of Haiti were the way they were. This moderates Haitian’s accountability for unfriendly or unwelcoming behaviour and conversationally works to make Habib’s claims appear balanced and sympathetic

it was of course (0.1) it was (0.3) something overwhelming for all (0.2) suddenly in two hour (0.1) and (0.1) two days (0.3) uh: people wehre invhahding this uh (0.1) you know (0.1) humanitarians were invading this country (lines 17-20)

Habib’s account concludes with an upshot, in this case at line 22 “so: (0.2) that was really (0.1) really challenging uh (0.3) in that sense”. The second occurrence of this formula in Habib’s turn begins at line 23 “I I I stayed for three months there and I I still don’t feel that I was accepted by hah ihany of the people I worked with” and is followed by an elaboration

(.) it was ah (.) a daily challenge just to uh (0.8) ah (0.6) you know convince them (0.2) with a new (0.1) point of view: (0.3) convince them of a new (0.2) way to work (1.0) they always had: (0.6) uh: (0.3) this: feeling that (0.2) ‘no you don’t know we (0.3) we know how to deal with the things’(0.5) even if I’m (0.1) bringing uhm (0.5) uh experiences from outside (lines 25-30)

As in the earlier example of the formula, Habib’s stance and elaboration are followed by mitigating circumstances in which accountability for Haitians not accepting Habib is moderated and made circumstantial

But it’s also I think uh (0.6) because the people were: (0.2) you know had (.) really harsh (0.4) eh even the people that we were working with they had (0.2) they lost maybe (.) someone lost the family’s: (0.5) houses and stuff (lines 34-37)

Habib concludes his account of not being accepted or achieving belonging in Haiti with an upshot at line 37 “so the whol:e uh (0.5) uh e energy around (0.2) eh the place it was (0.2) it was extremely negative in the in the beginning”, which reiterates contextual factors, in this case the “energy around (0.2) eh the place” as largely determinant of the degree to which belonging is possible.

Section Summary

In the first part of this chapter I have examined participants’ accounts of belonging in local communities. I have showed how participants treated belonging as an accountable activity, whether the subject was introduced by the interviewer or made relevant by the participant. In these accounts participants worked to avoid blame for not fitting in, building immunity to such potential accusations by working up their effortful trying, formulating not belonging as normal and constructing contextual factors as ultimately determinant of the degree to which they were able to achieve belonging. I also showed how participants worked to avoid or moderate negative claims about local people, which might potentially have negative conversational implications for their own identities. In the following section I look more closely at participants’ use of identity in relation to discussion of belonging.

IDENTITY IN TALK OF BELONGING

In this section I examine a pattern observed in the data in which participants made relevant personal claims in the talk immediately preceding discussion of belonging in local communities. As mentioned in the section above, talk of belonging was variously elicited and volunteered; sometimes the interviewer brought it up and on other occasions participants discussed belonging in response to a question about another topic. Identity was not directly asked about in any of these extracts and so in each of them we see it was the participant who oriented to, and made relevant,

information about themselves, and this always preceded subsequent talk of belonging. In the first extract below, Maria has just finished an account of what it was like working in the field.

Extract 5

- 1
1 I: Ok right ihm. (cough) so what do you think um (..) when you
2 were working in these places in the field do you feel did you
3 tend to feel like you became a part of the community or that
4 you generally were always an outsider?
5 Maria: That's interesting um (.)
6 That was one of my principal grievances actually, I felt like
7 there was even disdain by the humanitarian community
8 towards the quote unquote beneficiaries at times
9 I: Ihim
10 Maria: And um I (...) I mean (..) did I f feel I never felt like part of the
11 refugee community when I was living in um different places I
12 would sort of integrate into the local community depending on
13 where I was
14 I: Ihim

Maria begins her reply by providing an assessment of the interviewers' question, characterising it as "interesting" at line five. In doing so she treats the interviewer's turn not as a question requiring an answer but as a topic of conversation in itself. This response achieves two ends; firstly, it functions as a way of avoiding directly answering the question without appearing to have ignored the interviewer's previous turn; and secondly it works to shift the conversational implications of the question so that what comes next (a personal claim rather than a direct answer to the question) is made procedurally relevant.

Maria's personal claim, referred to above, begins at line six where she produces a stance about the humanitarian community's treatment of beneficiaries "that was one of my principal grievances actually, I felt like there was even disdain by the humanitarian community towards the quote unquote beneficiaries at times". In this

turn Maria sets up a group or category of people “the humanitarian community” to which she establishes herself as standing in opposition, at least on a number of issues about which she has more than one grievance “that was *one* of my principal grievances”. By positioning herself in opposition to the negative characteristics of a particular group, in this case the humanitarian community, Maria is able to indirectly infer a positive identity for herself. An indirect claim such as this, may be designed to elicit less resistance than a direct claim, which works here because the interviewer accepts this construction without questioning the claim by providing only an “ihim” as a receipt for Maria’s turn. Having dealt with the business of identity, Maria goes on to address the topic of the interviewer’s question about belonging at line 10.

Throughout the interviews we see a similar process of self-construction before participants discuss belonging. Below, Sebastian responds similarly when asked about working in the field.

Extract 6

- 1
- 1 I: Oh ok interesting. So um what were the main challenges of
- 2 working in the field, did you feel that you ah became a part of
- 3 the community or did you feel more like an outsider?
- 4 Sebastian: Er I think e e in terms of I’m a li I’m a little bit I’m sure you
- 5 know him I’m a bit of a Mark Duffield fan myself. Um (..) I eh,
- 6 well not a fan but I like his work definitely I think he’s a very
- 7 intelligent guy
- 8 I: Ihim
- 9 Sebastian: And um I’ve tried to start my PhD with him but lets lets talk
- 10 about that later ehaha
- 11 I: Ok
- 12 Sebastian: The I think for me the first time I was I was basically thrown
- 13 into the field like without any preparation whatsoever
- 14 I: Ihim
- 15 Sebastian: Ehm so its kind of e i its its tricky its tricky the main challenges
- 16 would be of course like the first time you’re confronted its it
- 17 psychologically emm how could I say confrontational

Like Maria, Sebastian does not directly answer the interviewer's question about becoming part of the community while working in the field. Instead, again like Maria, he introduces a third party at line five "I'm a bit of a Mark Duffield fan myself". Mark Duffield is a Professor of Sociology from Bristol University who is published in the area of aid and development. Sebastian's project to construct himself in a particular way in this turn is evident because he is careful to modify the way he characterises himself from a "fan" at line three to someone who "like(s) his work" and "think(s) he's a very intelligent guy". In comparison to the original term "fan" this latter construction offers more information about Sebastian's relationship to Professor Duffield and implies he has read and considered Mark Duffield's work. In aligning himself with Professor Duffield, and making personal claims such as "I've tried to start my PhD with him" (line 8) Sebastian is claiming membership of a particular category of person; that of a thinker, an intellectual and aid worker with an academic interest in what he does (Hester & Eglin, 1996). Like Maria above, it is only after he has attended to the business of self-construction, that Sebastian orients to the subject of the interviewer's question about the challenges of working in the field at line 14.

In the extract below, the participant, Emily, responds to a question about something she said earlier about living in Congo, and fitting in.

Extract 7

- 1 I: You said earlier the hardest thing about living in Congo is being
- 2 white, could you tell me more about that?
- 3 Emily: What I meant was that the hardest part of of my experience in Congo
- 4 was being white. There are certainly many (0.2) many things more
- 5 difficult than (0.4) my own experience there. In fact I love th Congo
- 6 and have deeply enjoyed living there. But on to the question at hand.

The first few lines of Emily's response are constructed as an aside, rather than a direct answer to the question. This is achieved in part at line six when Emily says

“but on to the question at hand”. This signals that what was said before this point is not her proper answer, in contrast to what is about to come, which she indicates for the interviewer, should be heard as her answer to the question.

Emily’s subsequent claims that there “are certainly many, many things more difficult than my own experience there” (line 4) and “I love Congo and have deeply enjoyed living there” (line 5) indicate that she treats the question as containing implications for her identity. Rather than saying something about herself, Emily makes a comment in which certain implications about her character are made available. In the first she displays awareness of other’s struggles acknowledging that “there are many, many things more difficult than my own experience there”. In the second she produces a positive stance about Congo “I love Congo and have deeply enjoyed living there”. These two statements work to dispense with any possible negative implications about her identity that might be available in the question, constructing herself instead as both sensitive to the plight of others and positive about Congo itself.

In the extract below we revisit the same point in the interview with Rose as in extract one, as she has finished detailing her experience in the humanitarian industry.

Extract 8

- 1
1 I: Ok, gosh quite a bit of experience then, that’s great. So could you tell
2 me, thinking back to when you’ve gone and worked in the field (.) can
3 you tell me about what some of the main challenges are, in working in
4 the field?
5 Rose: Ah are we talking about professional challenges or like living there,
6 what exactly are you, what what
7 I: Yeah more like personal challenges like living there and and ah you
8 know living and working there but more like your personal
9 adjustment

10 Rose: Ya ok um well I would say that part of my interest in working in this
 11 field you know like development and humanitarian, you always meet
 12 or you tend to meet new cultures and you meet people and different
 13 ways of living and it is very enriching and is extremely interesting but
 14 it can be sometimes a bit, a bit different and you are almost always or
 15 always the foreigner and I'd say as I've worked mainly for UN
 16 agencies you tend to be seen as well as may more than if you worked
 17 for an NGO the rich one, the rich person that comes from outside and
 18 so I'd say what was challenging was to always be perceived as other↑
 19 I: Ihim

Rose begins her response to the question at line eight. Rather than discussing the challenges of her work as asked by the interviewer, she lists her “interest in working in this field”. In so doing Rose makes relevant information about herself, providing a construction of her identity as someone for whom “part of (their) interest in working in this field” is “meet(ing) new cultures” (line 10), “meet(ing) people” (line 10), experiencing “different ways of living” (line 10), and for whom this is “very enriching and extremely interesting” (line 11). This list of related traits concerns her interest in travel and diversity and in this context function as exemplars of a category to which they belong and to which Rose implicitly refers. Therefore, in listing these features of her identity, Rose is referencing a category of person to which she claims membership – a traveller who is open to, and interested in, meeting new cultures and people and different ways of living.

Having constructed herself in a particular way Rose goes on to answer the interviewer’s question about challenges, making relevant belonging in the community. Like Emily, Maria and Sebastian above, Rose engages in a process of self-definition or identity-construction before progressing to talk about belonging.

Section Summary

Throughout the extracts in the second section, and indeed the interviews in general, participants responded in particular ways to questions that, whether explicitly or not, elicited discussion of acceptance or ‘fitting in’ in local communities. Before

discussion of acceptance, participants first engaged in a process of self-construction, and sometimes that process also involved the construction of others such as the aid community, local people and local officials. Participants' discussion of others' identities typically occurred in service to the construction of their own identity, as in extract one. Participants rarely made direct claims about themselves, rather they made available particular inferences through discussion of other people or places.

CONCLUSION

In this chapter I have looked at participants' discussion of belonging in local communities. Examination of the data showed that when participants talked about belonging they did not provide straight forward accounts, rather they worked up their constructions in particular ways to provide richer and lengthier formulations. This pattern of providing a longer answer is expected in an interview context in which convention dictates that the interviewee provides more than a simple answer to interviewers' questions (Mazeland & Ten Have, 1996). However, these longer accounts about belonging occurred even when talk of belonging was volunteered and made relevant by the participant rather than elicited by a question from the interviewer. Participants, therefore, did not treat belonging as straightforward, but rather a practice for which an account was interactionally necessary.

Participants accounts were notable in that not one participant claimed to have achieved a sense of belonging in the community in which they worked. Instead, their failure to belong was made normal and expected. Many participants however, worked up their trying; recounting behaviours and strategies used in order to fit in and be accepted. Not belonging was attributed to contextual factors such as the nature of aid workers' placements (for example as too short), essential differences between locals and foreigners (such as differences in appearance) and local perceptions of aid workers (as wealthier and more privileged). The aid workers interviewed constructed belonging as a project into which they invested much time

and effort, but which was ultimately unachievable because of contextual realities beyond their control. Appeals to essentialist notions of difference, as well as the local community's immutable perceptions of aid workers, worked to divest participants of full interactional responsibility for not belonging. Thereby indicating that participants treated belonging as an activity for which they might be internationally held accountable, and which therefore required work in order to moderate potential issues of blame.

Participants' constructions of locals as partly responsible for not accepting aid workers despite aid workers' efforts to fit in, were done in particular ways. Participants did not make directly negative claims. Instead they used a number of strategies to make available negative inferences that could be drawn about the local population, but worked to formulate these claims in ways that immunised them against potentially adverse interactional consequences. These adverse interactional consequences may be related to assumptions that could be made about an aid worker who speaks critically about the people they are there to help. In other words, participants were attending to issues of inadvertent self-construction, in which their critique of someone else, reflects badly on themselves (Stokoe & Smithson, 2001). So participants, who described having not been accepted by local communities, carefully managed potentially negative stances about those local communities, and avoided any directly negative claims about them.

This contradicts our current understanding of belongingness seeking behaviours, studied in labs. Participants who had been rejected or failed to belong, even by one member of a group, behaved in explicitly antisocial ways toward the entire group (Chow et al, 2008; Leary, Twenge, & Quinlivan, 2006; Thau, Aquino, & Poortvliet, 2007). Punishing them with louder noise blasts and selecting less desirable snacks (Twenge, 2001; van Beest, & Williams, 2006). These findings have confused researchers because it would seem more likely that, once rejected, participants would behave in even more prosocial ways than earlier in order to work to gain

belonging in the group, the antisocial behaviour observed would surely only serve to further decrease their likelihood of achieving belonging. Yet in this study participants worked up their continued trying and prosocial behaviours, despite rejection. They worked up the impact of context and inherent difference as the reasons why they weren't able to be accepted, thereby avoiding blame themselves and the potentially negative interactional consequences of placing that blame on locals. Rather than engaging in overtly or obviously retaliatory behaviour toward those who had rejected them, in this study participants engaged in a process of careful management of accountability and blame.

The second pattern observed in the data and discussed in this chapter was that of the self-construction work participants did before talking about belonging. Whether talk of belonging was volunteered or elicited, participants preceded this talk with information that made available positive inferences that could be drawn about themselves; for example, as a good aid worker, a person open to new experiences or someone interested in different cultures. This process of self-construction worked to immunise against the potentially negative consequences of the belongingness talk to come. Talk of belonging then was treated by participants as involving interactional risks to identity, which they worked to head off and immunise against through a process of self-construction. Notably, given no participants claimed to have achieved belonging, the risks to identity may only be associated with failure to belong, which was treated as a negative reflection on self. These findings support current understandings of the relationship between identity and belonging; that identity mediates belonging. One's identity is theorised to impact on the type of groups to which one can achieve belonging, so that having an identity as a basketball player, for example, makes it easier to belong in a group of athletes. The evidence from this study supports a link between identity and belonging. Participants oriented to issues of identity when talking about belonging, and made these relevant in the interaction in order to do self-construction. It is not clear from

this data, the nature of the relationship between identity and belonging, but there is evidence to support a link.

In this chapter I have examined belonging as a practice in the interviews. I have shown that achieving belonging is not a straightforward matter for participants, and that the project of belonging for aid workers contains interactional risks which require careful management. Belongingness is treated as an accountable matter, and therefore participants worked to demonstrate their 'trying' whilst also constructing the project as ultimately futile because of immutable contextual factors. In the next chapter I examine one common strategy participants' described using to fit in in the local community; that of adopting certain conventions of dress common among local people. This is a topic familiar to most aid workers, but much like belongingness, rarely directly addressed in either humanitarian literature or policy and guideline documents.

Chapter 5: Belonging and Dress

Aid workers preparing to travel to another country for work can find a proliferation of informal advice about what to wear when in the field. The great majority of this is found on blogs and other such websites providing both serious and satirical advice on what an aid worker ought to wear. Below are several examples of reflections on clothing featured in blogs written by, and for aid workers.

Shirts that are durable, easy to hand wash and extend down over your hips, farther than the bottom of your butt, that do not expose any of your cleavage whatsoever, and are not at all transparent. (Coyotecomunications.com, 2016)

Breathable Clothing: When deciding what clothing to take with you, choose items that can easily be layered and are comfortable to work in. This will help keep your packing list compact and help you to mix and match your clothing items. Clothing that dries quickly and is made with moisture wicking material is a good option.
(Disasterready.org, 2016)

Pack for conservativeness, a lot of long baggy tops (some that are actually dresses, or swimsuit caftans) and long skirts. I also packed an abaya that a friend lent me, that has already come in handy to cover up on the way to a cocktail party!
(Chasingcarly.blogspot.co.nz, 2016)

A satirical take on dressing as an aid worker from the very popular site Stuff Expat Aid Workers Like is provided below.

A sure way to win the hearts and minds of your local colleagues is to dress like them. Or how you think they should dress... or how they used to dress before they started dressing like you do back home. By adopting their dress, not only are you showing your affinity with them, you are also respecting their country and culture. And you will be much more likely to blend in. The giggles you hear are the locals' way of showing appreciation, and the stares are looks of true admiration. (Seaw1, 2016)

This extract shows that 'what to wear' is a familiar theme among aid workers and also makes the link between the way aid workers dress and belonging, by referring to blending in and demonstrating respect; albeit ironically. Although there is plenty of advice on how to dress as an aid worker, and links made to belonging in blogs and other informal sources, almost nothing is available in industry or best practice guidelines, nor internal documentation from aid agencies. A thorough search of the internet, the literature, UN documentation and correspondence with former colleagues in the aid industry (many of whom are now in very senior positions) failed to turn up any formal documentation on dressing to fit in. My own anecdotal experience is that dressing in ways thought to be most acceptable to the host community is widely used as a resource for belonging, particularly among women. In the interviews clothing and dress was a common theme; participants both made it relevant themselves or took up the issue from the interviewer's questions. In this chapter I examine this talk, and explore the link between the way one dresses, and belonging. The dearth of material available on the subject in practice guidelines is mirrored in academic literature. There has not yet been an analysis published of the role of clothing or appearance in relation to belonging, either in humanitarian or psychological literature. This is despite the generally accepted theoretical position that belonging is mediated by identity, and the numerous studies on the role of clothing in the construction of identity (see Bruzzi, 1997; Crane, 2012; Davis, 1994; Twigg, 2014). Twigg (2014) claims clothing is used as a resource for doing interactional work, as a form semiotics. A lot of interactional work can arguably be

done through the way one dresses. Consider, for example, the meanings typically associated with wearing a head scarf as a woman, or fish net stockings and heels, or a visibility vest. Each accomplishes, or at least makes available, particular inferences about the wearer, that can then either be resisted or taken up by the wearer and those with which the wearer interacts. Clothing can function as a useful short hand, and in the extracts contained in this chapter I explore talk of clothing in the interviews, particularly in relation to belonging. The extracts selected for this chapter were chosen because they were the most succinct, or because they were particularly clear, typical examples of the kind of work done by participants in the interviews.

ANALYSIS

I begin with the extract below which occurs near the middle of the interview after Monica has recounted a conversation she had with the head of security for her organisation in Afghanistan about the importance of women employees wearing a headscarf in public.

Extract 1

- 1
1 I: I suppose what I'm getting at sorry, is if you didn't wear the
2 head scarf
3 Monica: Yeah
4 I: What was uh, what would happen? What d what was said to
5 happen what was the the security threat there, the safety threat?
6 Monica: Um the idea if just that you are noticed because there's a lot of
7 uh, intelligence gathering within the community information
8 that's shared uh with the bad guys
9 I: Aha
10 Monica: It's like neighbourhood watch all the time like everyone knows
11 what everyone's doing all the time, so it'd just be that you
12 would be noticed but I you know my thought was they're
13 noticing me anyway, I am very clearly not an Afghan woman, I

14 am very clearly a Western woman and that's the case no matter
 15 how Afghan I try to dress or act. So I'm gonna be noticed.
 16 I: Right
 17 Monica: And I didn't, my personal thought was whether or not I'm
 18 wearing a scarf in the car is a different thing, it's not like I was
 19 going into a Mosque. I mean there was like one time I went into
 20 a bazaar and I wore my scarf when I did that
 21 I: Ihim, yeah
 22 Monica: When I went in to a government office I wore my scarf or when
 23 there was prayers in the office I put on my scarf, but that was
 24 more for me (...) u th again that was I mean for the prayers that
 25 was a sign of respect, same in the government offices, in the
 26 bazaar it was more to uh, draw less attention to myself

In response to the interviewer's questions Monica works up an account of what the 'idea' is behind her posing a security risk to the organisation by not wearing a headscarf which is "just that you are noticed" and that this leads to 'intelligence gathering' about you, which might be "shared with the bad guys". At line 12 Monica contrasts this with her own 'thought' by producing a stance, making gender and ethnicity relevant here for the first time in this extract in an explicit way "I am very clearly not an Afghan woman, I am very clearly a Western woman". Notably 'Afghan' and 'Western' are not the same order of category – 'Western' refers to a region of the world while Afghan relates to a sub-category of the larger category 'Eastern' which stands in contrast to Western. However, the participant treats as common knowledge that Afghanistan is not part of the category Western and therefore can be used as a contrast in the way she has used it. Monica's formulation also constructs Afghan people's potential problem with her as about her membership of the wider category of Westerner rather than as a member of a specific country category. The problem, as she has constructed it, is her nationality rather than her gender; although she makes gender relevant because of course she could simply have said 'I am very clearly a Westerner not an Afghan'.

In the extract, so far, Monica has made several references to belonging, or a degree of belonging. At lines six, 15 and twice at line 12 Monica refers to being 'noticed'.

She uses being 'noticed' as the aspect of the security officer's position that she works to discredit or undermine. Monica argues that wearing a headscarf on the street will not prevent her from being noticed, that her identity as a Western woman will be visible "no matter how Afghan I try to dress or act" (line 14). At line 17 Monica's argument changes from that of setting up and then dismantling the security officer's position by showing that the head scarf is not useful for avoiding being noticed; to arguing for the use of a head scarf by detailing the contexts in which it is useful. This attends to issues of stake and interest, so that she cannot be accused of being insensitive to cultural matters related to dress, rather that the headscarf should be worn only when effective. Monica starts by setting up a contrast pair between two locations; 'the car' and 'a mosque' beginning at line 17 "whether or not I'm wearing a scarf in the car is a different thing, it's not like I was going into a Mosque". According to membership categorisation analysis (MCA) these two locations can each be considered categories with different corresponding category-bound predicates (Housley & Fitzgerald, 2002). Monica treats these locations as already familiar to the interviewer, as well as the reason why the car might be an appropriate place in which to choose not to wear a head scarf while a mosque is not, as she offers no explanation. Using shared knowledge, we could guess that it is the religious aspect of the second location that renders it a context in which a head scarf should be worn, but this is left implied.

Monica further elaborates at line 19 beginning with 'I mean' signalling she is about to clarify her previous point; "I mean there was like one time I went into a bazaar and I wore my scarf when I did that". She has added a third location, a bazaar, in which she implies it is appropriate that a 'scarf' be worn by reporting her own behaviour; that the 'one time' she went there she wore her 'scarf'. Again she treats as understood by the interviewer the reason why this location is a place in which a scarf should be worn because she provides no further explanation. Using common knowledge, we might guess here that the defining feature about this location

compared to the other is that it is a public place and perhaps also a place where groups of people congregate.

After the interviewer's receipt "ihim, yeah" at line 22 Monica goes on to offer further locations in a scripted format (Heritage, 2005) signalling the scripted behaviour by beginning with 'when I' which characterises it as something routine; "when I went in to a government office I wore my scarf or when there was prayers in the office I put on my scarf" (line 22-23). Again Monica treats the locations as known by the interviewer and provides no further comment on what aspect of those locations makes them contexts in which a headscarf should be worn. However she does specify by modifying the location 'office' as only requiring a scarf to be worn when prayers are held. So presumably it is the presence of religious activity that modifies the category of 'office' into a place in which a head scarf should be worn. This is confirmed by Monica as she continues, saying "but that was more for me (...) u th again that was I mean for the prayers that was a sign of respect". Monica here characterises wearing the scarf as something she desires to do in some contexts "that was more for me", and her wearing of the scarf as a way in which she can signal a stance: "as a sign of respect".

Monica goes on to provide the reason for her wearing a scarf in 'the government offices' by immediately following the preceding claim about respect with "same in the government offices". She contrasts this location and reason by skip-connecting (Sacks, 1992) to her earlier location 'the bazaar', "in the bazaar it was more to uh, draw less attention to myself". Here she provides an alternative reason for wearing her scarf; as a way in which she can affect other's behaviour toward her so that she 'draws less attention'. Monica uses a different formulation than that used earlier in the extract of 'being noticed' (line 6). This works both to distinguish her position as different from that of the security officer, and also treats belonging as more nuanced than current theoretical understandings of belonging as a binary state; that is, one either belongs or does not. In this extract Monica refers to different types, or levels,

of belonging; belonging to a degree that one draws “less attention” to oneself (line 26) and belonging to the extent that one is not noticed in a crowd (line 6). These are distinguished by Monica in service of her argument against wearing a head scarf at all times. References to different kinds of belonging were found throughout participants’ discussion of belonging, which I highlight and discuss in reference to other extracts below.

The extract below occurs toward the end of a lengthy discussion about places in which Erin does or does not wear a head scarf.

Extract 2

- 1 Erin: And I’d take it with me in case you know, if we were out and there the
- 2 security the threats were higher or if we got stuck in traffic cause its
- 3 different if you’re just driving by or if you’re stopped and there are
- 4 people walking by and whatever you don’t want to draw (.) extra
- 5 attention.

Appealing to common knowledge “you know” at line one Erin makes her wearing of the head scarf dependent on context and potential eventualities associated with those contexts - if she was out and “the security the threats were higher” or if she was in a car or other vehicle and “we got stuck in traffic” (lines 2). Erin treats the relationship between security threats and head scarves as common knowledge because she does not offer any explanation about why one might wear a headscarf when ‘security threats are higher’. The significance of being stuck in traffic, however, is treated as warranting explanation which Erin provides at lines 2-4 “cause its different if you’re just driving by or if you’re stopped and there are people walking by and whatever you don’t want to draw extra attention”. However, Erin does not explain why not wearing a headscarf draws attention to oneself – she treats this as understood. The other aspect of her explanation that Erin leaves implicit is why one might wish not to ‘draw extra attention’ to oneself. The reason that aid workers, and perhaps because she is speaking about feminine dress,

women aid workers, would wish to avoid drawing attention to themselves is also treated as common knowledge or at least understood by the interviewer. The proximity of this statement to her earlier reference to security at line one suggests that the two might be related. So avoiding attention is hearable here as related to security and Erin treats this relationship as common knowledge.

Like Monica in extract one, Erin refers to a type of belonging; belonging to the extent that one does not draw attention, or at least extra attention, from others. Wearing a headscarf is worked up as useful for this purpose, and so is constructed as a resource for doing this level of belonging.

In the extract below Bahir, an in-country director of security for the UN, also makes relevant the relationship between drawing attention to oneself through clothing, and personal security.

Extract 3

- 1 I: Ok (.) and (.) so what about um ((clears throat)) so it's interesting that
2 you raise that sort of eh (.) cultural differences between um (.) i w i the
3 reception of security um directives, what about gender differences
4 ahm (.) did you haf to:: ((G coughs)) have separate uh security policies
5 or separate security (.) processes for uhm women: as opposed to men
6 (.) or or how did that work
7 Bahir: Yes in fact we did and uh you (.) know here we talk about equality
8 and uh you know uh everybody's the same but iu we did and in
9 particular Western women uhm they were a bit of an anomaly to to
10 the Sudanese in the area I was working in so you've got a blonde blue
11 eyed uh (.) lady that doesn't have her uh head covering on or you
12 know she's quite ah uh wearing a short sleeve shirt um it raises eyes
13 and from there the security of that person is at risk (.) in those areas.

The interviewer's question is constructed by skip connecting (Sacks, 1992) to the participant's previous turn which contained discussion of security "so it's interesting that you raise that sort of eh (.) cultural differences between um (.) i w i

the reception of security um directives what about gender differences" (lines 1-2). Bahir demonstrates alignment with the interviewer's projected stance that gender and security are related by making the sense of his response dependent on the interviewer's question saying just "yes in fact we did". This answer relies on the content of the question to indicate who the subject is and what the action is to which he refers. Bahir goes on to elaborate by drawing a distinction between what 'we talk about' (line 6) and what 'we did' (line 7). In particular, that although "here we talk about equality and uh you know everybody's the same": the 'but' that follows this stance signals that this is not how it was in Sudan.

At line seven Bahir introduces the category 'Western women' which is a modification of one of the categories made available in the interviewer's question; the categories of gender such as male or female, man or woman, to which Bahir has added regional or cultural specification by using 'western'. As in Extract 3, Bahir's construction demonstrates disalignment with a proposition inherent in the interviewer's question; that women aid workers are a homogenous group. Bahir goes on to describe the way this category is perceived by Sudanese in the area in which he worked; as an anomaly (line 8). This builds background for Bahir's coming claim about clothing and security constructed as an upshot signalled by the 'so' at line eight. Bahir embarks on this claim by describing some (stereo)typical category bound attributes of Western women in order to refer to them rather than naming the category itself "so you've got a blonde blue eyed uh (.) lady". These attributes are each appearance based which works to heighten the distinction between local people and Western women, providing further basis on which they might be perceived as an anomaly. Bahir continues building his description of the Western woman he will use in his coming claim "that doesn't have her uh head covering on or you know she's quite ah uh wearing a short sleeve shirt" (lines 10-11). At line ten Bahir starts and then truncates a stance "you know she's quite ah uh" – perhaps quite scantily clad, or inappropriately clad – but abandons it in favour of more straight forward description "wearing a short sleeved shirt" indicating that this is a

potentially sensitive topic about which inferences might be drawn about the participant himself if he were to complete his stance as it was first formulated.

After having worked up his answer and a description of the kind of person about whom he is speaking, Bahir makes a stance “um it raises eyes and from there the security of that person is at risk (.) in those areas”. Like Erin above, Bahir links clothing, in this instance a head scarf and short sleeved shirt, to personal security through the mediating factor of drawing attention to oneself. Wearing a headscarf is treated by Bahir as a way of doing belonging to the extent that one does not “raise eyes”.

Extract 4 below contains Habib’s response to a question by the interviewer linking integration, or belonging, and dress.

Extract 4

- 1 I: I was wondering if you ever did anything to about your appearance in
2 order to um (.) integrate better like for example (.) dressing differently
3 Habib:Dressing code is extremely important I think
4 I: Okay
5 Habib:Even for men (..) so for example in one pla one areas you cannot wear
6 pants in Yemen because uh (..) it’s not okay (.) you have to wear a kind
7 of ah (.) you know this uh (...) like the Indian they they wrap ah
8 something ah around their waist so (you) even expats have to hah
9 sometimes wear this just to fit in and uh being you know able to work
10 and speak to the local people

Habib begins his response to the interviewer’s question by producing a stance, that “dressing code is extremely important I think...even for men” (lines 3-5). The ‘even’ here is used to indicate that this is not what might usually be expected, and of course makes relevant gender by the use of the category ‘men’. Having made explicit his stance, Habib goes on to explain and account for this stance by providing an example to support his claim. Like other accounts of dress in earlier extracts his example is context bound by location; “one pla one areas” (line 5). This

location is made notable because “you cannot wear pants” (line 5), and the reason Habib provides is “because uh (..) it’s not okay” (line 6). Habib does not explain why it is not okay, indicating that the reason is not important to his point, or perhaps he considers the interviewer to have sufficient shared knowledge of aid work as to render an explanation unnecessary. Habib’s coming reference to common knowledge “you know” (line 7) in describing what “you have to wear” (line 6) is perhaps an indication that he is relying on common knowledge for other un-explicated details in the extract such as the reason pants cannot be worn. Habib’s description of the item of clothing to which he refers is “a kind of ah (.) you know this uh (...) like the Indian they they wrap ah something ah around their waist”. The description builds in a cultural distance to the clothing because Habib does not use a name for the item, which it presumably has, rather he uses a simile to liken it to the clothing of another culture “like the Indian” and refers to it in generalised and non-specific ways as “a kind of ah” (line 6) “this uh” (line 7) “something ah” (line 7) finally referring to it by the way it is worn “they wrap uh something ah around their waist” (line 8). This treatment of the item of clothing works to establish a cultural distance between Habib and the clothing, making it something with which he is not familiar.

Formulated as an upshot (using ‘so’) Habib says “so (you) even expats have to hah sometimes wear this”. The laugh between ‘to’ and ‘sometimes’ perhaps functioning to extend that cultural distance worked up earlier in his turn by treating expatriate’s wearing of this item of clothing as something comical, remarkable or unusual. Habib makes wearing the clothing ‘sometimes necessary’ in order to “fit in and uh being you know able to work and speak to the local people” (line 9). Like Erin and Bahir above, Habib constructs belonging, or ‘fit(ting) in’, as the mediating factor between dress and some other goal – in this case “being able to work and speak to local people”.

In the next extract Karen responds to a question from the interviewer about the extent to which she feels like a part of the communities in which she works.

Extract 5

- 1 I: So do you feel that um (.) you talked about being yourself at other
2 times when you leave when you're on leave or you're or you go home
3 because you can wear the clothes that you would normally wear
4 Karen: Yeah
5 I: Sso when you go in to those communities do you typically feel like
6 you're a part you become a part of those communities or they become
7 a part of you in any way or do you tend to feel more like a eh a visitor
8 or um um a guest
9 Karen: Mm I really um I try to integrate as much as possible and uh I I I try to
10 get local friends and to not you know just stick with the international
11 crowd
12 I: Ihim
13 Karen: And I feel it's very important for me to be able to blend in be able to be
14 accepted so that I can you know know about the society and be able to
15 do a better job you know based on that knowledge (.) so to me
16 integration is very important so I don't see it as something that really
17 affects my personality because its for a short (.) period of time and its
18 professional its work so um ah the good friendships that I make
19 though I keep um even when I leave um and I I I make them aware
20 that you know I'm blending in but I'm not like this um in other
21 countries and in even for them they're not like that in other countries
22 they (.) remove the veil when they're in other countries so so I I think
23 uh I mean um I find the balance there

The interviewer begins by making relevant clothing in the first line saying "you talked about being yourself... because you can wear the clothes that you would normally wear" – in the set-up to the question she develops between lines five and seven about whether the participant feels she "become(s) a part of (the) communities" in which she lives and works. Karen's response at line eight begins with a feature identified in Chapter 4 in which participants emphasised their

'trying' in integrating or becoming accepted into the community. This functions to construct their behaviour as effortful and to manage blame by avoiding potential inferences that they may be in some way at fault (De Kok & Widdicombe, 2008). Here Karen says "mm I really um I try to integrate as much as possible and uh I I I try to get local friends" (line 8). Karen's response is formulated as being about what she *does* rather than what the question calls for which is what she *feels* and works to signal some non-alignment with the interviewer's previous turn (Lampropoulou & Myers, 2013).

At line 11 Karen says "and I feel it's very important for me to be able to blend in be able to be accepted". There are two notable aspects to this turn. Firstly, Karen uses the affective lexical term 'feel' which echoes that used in the question and functions to demonstrate, simply, that she is responding to the question (DuBois, 2007). Secondly Karen transforms the agenda from a report of her affective state to an opportunity to establish a stance "it's very important" (line 11). She constructs "blend(ing) in" and "being accepted" (line 12) as important so that ultimately she can "do a better job" (line 12-13). At this point Karen has not described how one might achieve blending in, but later in her turn Karen refers to "the veil" in reference to this "I'm blending in but I'm not like this um in other countries and in even for them they're not like that in other countries they (.) remove the veil when they're in other countries". Karen leaves unsaid but hints that she wears the veil and perhaps other items of clothing in order to blend in by saying that even 'they' – hearable here as local women – remove the veil in other countries. The 'even' functions to imply that both parts of the comparison pair in her account, that is 'I' and 'they', wear the veil when they are in this context but not while in others.

Like other participants in this chapter, Karen makes belonging or "blending in" and "being accepted" the mediating factor between dress and a particular goal or outcome, in this case "doing a better job". She also refers to belonging in more than one way, the first as "blending in" and the second as "being accepted". This mirrors

other participants' treatment of belonging in which different degrees or types of belonging become possible in their constructions; belonging is not treated as binary.

In the extract below the interviewer skip connects (Sacks, 1992) to the issue of dress, enquiring about something the participant said earlier, who responds in a way observed in many of the interviews conducted for this study.

Extract 6

- 1 I: And you said that where you are living is reasonably liberal so you
2 can ah kind of go swimming and wear sleeveless tops and things,
3 have you changed the way you dress at all having been there or do
4 you dress the same way that you did in Ireland?
5 Mary: No, I have I I have changed I don't dress the same that I do in Ireland.
6 If I was in Ireland here the temperature has been 45 47 degrees so you
7 know if I was in Ireland I would be wearing shorts and I would
8 probably be wearing very sleeveless kind of tops you know hehe
9 I: Mm yeah
10 Mary: But a eh and eh but here no I don't you know I have to respect their
11 culture so I wear sort of three-quarter length pants and I wear
12 sleeveless tops but you know I I wouldn't wear them everyday. And it
13 depends on the situation where I'm going and who I'm meeting, if I'm
14 meeting males I would wear a normal top.

Mary responds to the interviewer's question at line five by answering in what could be treated as a complete answer "no, I have I I have changed I don't dress the same that I do in Ireland". This is a turn complete unit (TCU) but Mary treats this as requiring further explanation and so elaborates by describing the climate where she is working and develops a comparison pair made up of Ireland and the place in which she now works. In conversation people typically provide description for a reason, for instance to work up a story (Sacks, 1992) or as a basis for an argument (Myers & Lamprapoulou, 2013). Here Mary gives a description of the climate to provide a basis for her coming claim that "in Ireland I would be wearing shorts and I would probably be wearing very sleeveless kind of tops" (lines 5-6). We know that

clothing is related to climate because Mary links the two with an upshot, 'so', at line five "here the temperature has been 45 47 degrees so you know if I was in Ireland I would be wearing shorts". Mary leaves implicit the reason why she would wear 'shorts' and 'very sleeveless kind of tops' in 45 or 47 degrees, however she appeals to common knowledge after this description by adding "you know" at line six. Using common knowledge we might assume that Mary considers those temperatures to be very warm because the clothing categories 'shorts' and 'sleeveless tops' are usually worn in warm weather.

After a receipt by the interviewer at line seven "Mm yeah" Mary develops her account of what she wears by introducing the second part of the comparison pair referred to simply as 'here' because the interviewer knows her location and of course it is now shared knowledge between interviewer and interviewee. Mary accounts for the reason why she dresses differently 'here' before she describes how her dress differs "but here no I don't you know I have to respect their culture" (line 10). Appealing to shared knowledge by saying "you know I have to respect their culture" Mary formulates modifying her dress as obligatory. By producing this stance in the way she has; as common knowledge and as an obligation, Mary constructs modifying one's dress as the minimum one ought to do in order to demonstrate respect for "their culture" (line 10). This is also done in service of belonging, however, because Mary goes on to make her clothing dependent on "the situation, where I'm going and who I'm meeting" (lines 12-13). She uses a three-part list (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 2008) suggesting the range of conditions on what she wears may be broader than those she has listed, but they fall into similar categories related to context.

In the following extract, as in Extract 6, the interviewer returns to something the participant said earlier in order to introduce a question about dress. Veronique is a Country Director for a UN organisation and so she manages a number of national and international staff.

Extract 7

- 1 I: Ok, ok great and and so the advocacy you say is very
2 important. What about what individual women do um in terms
3 of their behaviour or the way that they dress ehm or where they
4 go, is that something that's of a concern or something that you
5 give employees advice about or not?
- 6 Veronique: Eh (.) ok we have to kind of (inaudible) this: local and ex-patriot
7 and it's not the same
- 8 I: Yep
- 9 Veronique: Ehm so you have to make the different ehm fortunately it's like
10 this: eh local people know what to do I mean what to wear it's
11 their problem, but for ex-patriot what I think what I also say
12 always say is ah respect the local population
- 13 I: Ihim
- 14 Veronique: Respect the way they are dressed and try to be aware of what is
15 going on, how they dress and why, if there's a religion uh issue
16 or whatever. Uh I never said to a woman ex-patriot you don't,
17 you should not dress like that never, never happen. Eh its true
18 that some of them and I can suggest eh but not directly (...) uh
19 but this is my advice, just take care of what you dress because
20 of the respect of the population.

The interviewer's question projects a yes or no answer, with perhaps some elaboration given its length. Veronique, however, does not display alignment with the interviewer's offered stance rather she begins her response at line six with a statement that troubles the interviewer's turn by exposing an underlying assumption in the question; that women aid workers are a homogenous group, "Eh (.) ok we have to kind of (inaudible) this: local and expatriate and it's not the same" (lines 6-7). In that turn Veronique also here establishes a contrast pair between 'local (people)' and 'expatriates' (Jefferson, 1974).

At line eight Veronique provides the basis for her claim that locals and expatriates are "not the same" saying "eh local people know what to do I mean what to wear it's their problem, but for expatriate what I think what I also say always say is ah

respect the local population". In attending to 'what to wear' Veronique has picked up on one of the three topics the interviewer offered in her question; 'dress' (line 3), 'where they go' (line 3) and 'their behaviour' (line 3), and introduced the issue of respect as related to this. Veronique does not explain how 'what to wear' and 'respect (for) the local population' are related, though the link is implied by the proximity of the ideas to each other; being contained in the same clause, and their joint association as ways in which the two components of the contrast pair differ. Veronique may also be relying on common knowledge or shared knowledge with the interviewer because women's dress as related to cultural ideas about decency or respect is arguably part of a shared body of aid worker knowledge, although there is no evidence here that this is the case, other than that Veronique treats the statement as requiring no explanation.

Veronique elaborates on her statement at line 14 after the interviewer's continuer at line 13 "ihim" saying "respect the way they are dressed and try to be aware of what is going on, how they dress and why, if there's a religion uh issue or whatever". This elaboration is formulated as her quoted speech to expat women working for her, in the form of direct imperatives "respect the way they are dressed" and "try to be aware". 'They' is hearable as the 'local population' because this is the only other party to which Veronique has referred in this extract. Veronique constructs the way 'they' dress as meaningful "how they dress and why" (line 15) and value-laden "if there's a religion issue or whatever" (line 15). Veronique is not explicit about what women aid workers should do in order to respect the 'local population' other than to "be aware" (line 14), however the implication is, and perhaps she is relying on common knowledge, that expatriate women should mimic some aspects of 'local' women's dress, particularly those that might be related to 'religion issues' (line 15). Ultimately modifying the way one dresses is a project of gendered belonging for Veronique, because she distinguishes between men and women, and also local and expat women.

In extracts six and seven, dress is treated as something done for much more than superficial reasons and is constructed as a means of demonstrating respect for local people and aspects of their culture, such as religious beliefs. Clothing for women aid workers, it would seem, is produced as a means of displaying outwardly, and in a visible way, an inner stance; that of respect. This is ultimately a project of belonging because in both extracts the change of dress was dependent on context and the group of people with whom a person will be meeting. Dress was altered for these reasons in an effort to gain some belonging or acceptance among particular groups of people.

CONCLUSIONS

In this chapter I have examined participants' discussion of clothing and belonging in the interviews. This topic, whether introduced by the interviewer or made relevant by a participant, was treated as familiar by both the interviewer and participants. Discussions about 'what to wear' in the field were often lengthy and animated. As is evident from the extracts contained herein, participants argued both for and against changing the way one dresses, often in the same interview, demonstrating the topic is not treated as straight forward, and warrants some work being done in order to achieve the conversational goals with which it is associated.

Analysis of the data showed that participants constructed the relationship between belonging and dress in particular ways. The first was that belonging was positioned as a mediating factor between the way one dresses and achieving a particular goal. Dressing in certain ways achieves a degree of belonging which in turn either reduces the likelihood of violence being committed against you, or increases the ease with which you can go about your work. The kind of dress participants described adopting was typically one or two items of clothing that they constructed as meaningful to the local population such as a head covering or wrap; or a way of dressing that followed local conventions of dress such as covering one's legs or

shoulders. Clothing was constructed as a tool through which one could operationalise certain strategies for acceptance. For example, wearing a head scarf, although not treated as religiously significant to participants, was reported to be worn in order to fit in, or draw less attention to oneself. Participants sometimes made it clear that this was done purely for pragmatic reasons, and so clothing, rather than being a reflection of personality, the weather or mood even, was a resource for doing belonging in a context in which one might not ordinarily easily belong. One participant extended this beyond her own wearing of a head scarf, suggesting that even locals may wear the scarf for a similar reason, given that, as the participant pointed out, even locals don't wear a head scarf when they are in other countries.

Participants also made relevant gender in their discussion of clothing. This was typically done in reference to the end goal of security, rather than for ease of working. Women were constructed as targets for attention and therefore violence from local people, usually, in these constructions, men. One way of minimising or avoiding this threat was to dress in such a way as to reduce the likelihood of being noticed, which would in turn decrease the likelihood of assault. This is a potentially troubling construction, given that it mirrors victim-blaming rhetoric, in which women are frequently called to account, or held responsible for 'provoking' violence committed against them by men through the way they dress, where they go or who they associate with (Butler, 2011; Gavey, 2013). Notions of cultural relativism are sometimes used to defend gendered practices, such as requirements of dress that differ by gender. However recent scholarly work in this area argues against the acceptance of such practices under the defence of cultural relativism (Chakrabarty, 2009; Harrison, 2003). Culturally relativist arguments are associated with paternalistic colonialism which reifies as 'original' the practices of 'less developed' cultures, particularly those aspects that further their own interests (Chakrabarty, 2009; McEwan, 2001). Culturally relativist arguments are both used and resisted in the interviews, often by the same participant. Aid organisations should be mindful

to disrupt understandings of women, whether apparently culturally based or not, – both aid workers and locals – that ultimately work to marginalise one gender while benefitting the other.

Another finding from the analysis is that rather than treating belonging as binary, as it is in the theoretical literature, in practice, participants treated belonging as a scale or continuum. Participants spoke of, and contrasted, different levels of belonging. These levels ranged from simply demonstrating respect for a group, to ‘not being noticed’, through ‘blending in’ and finally ‘being accepted’. This represents a marked shift in the way in which belonging is conceived of, and for the study of belonging in the future. Evidence from this study suggests that belonging is not a matter of being achieved or not, but rather that there may be degrees of belong to be accomplished.

The final contribution of this chapter is that the analysis herein demonstrates that clothing is treated as one way in which people achieve belonging in a group. Yet this association between clothing and belonging has not yet been made, or explored, in published literature. Our understanding of belonging, and perhaps also related concepts such as identity, would be improved with further examination of the role of dress and clothing in the practice of belonging.

In the next, and final analytic, chapter I explore the association between belonging and security. The link between fitting in, or acceptance, and safety has been suggested in the security literature, and widely adopted in the humanitarian industry, but, again, has not been studied as a practice.

Chapter 6: Security

The context in which humanitarian aid is delivered has shifted in the past decade, so that aid agencies and donors have become increasingly focused on the safety and security of employees. Until the early 1990s aid workers had relied on claims of neutrality for protection in areas of conflict or political instability. However, the perception of aid workers and humanitarian agencies as neutral has eroded in recent years and put aid workers at potentially greater risk of harm. Several incidents have occurred in the past decade which shocked the international humanitarian community and changed the landscape of tacit trust that, it was believed, kept humanitarian workers safe. One such incident was the murder of 17 French aid workers in Sri Lanka in 2006; shot execution-style by the Sri Lankan army at the side of the road after the mini bus in which they were travelling was stopped and searched (BBC News, 2013). Some argue that change in donor government policy has led to mistrust between donors and recipients. In many countries money allocated for international aid and development has been redirected from areas of 'most need' to regions in which a political interest exists (Harmer, 2008). Donor government policy has evolved, therefore, particularly since 2001, reflecting a growing preoccupation with so-called weak and fragile states (Collinson, Elhawary & Muggah, 2010). These settings are considered to be sites of underdevelopment and human suffering, while presenting major threats to international peace and security. International response has been to seek to 'stabilise' such contexts in order to mitigate these perceived threats (Collinson et al, 2010). The turn toward stabilisation, sometimes referred to as 'winning hearts and minds', as a tool for the realisation of international interests has resulted in a

substantial change to the way international aid, but particularly development, is conducted (Stoddard, 2009).

One of the biggest changes has been the mobilisation of both 'hard' and 'soft' forms of intervention – military and humanitarian – into the same locations at overlapping or the same times (Haysom & Jackson, 2013). As outlined in the introductory chapter, many aid agencies rely on is colloquially termed 'the security triangle', as the main strategy for mitigating threats to aid workers' safety. This three-pronged approach includes gaining *acceptance* in the local community (a degree of belonging), *protection* from threats to safety and *deterrence* by posing a counter-threat (Avant, 2007). The degree to which an organisation focuses on each of these three factors to safeguard their safety varies between agencies, and sometimes by context as well. For some organisations that have placed greater reliance on deterrence and protection this has meant a closer association with military forces (Harmer, 2008). However, there is a perception among some in the humanitarian community that aid workers are placed at greater risk, and the ability of aid agencies to reach affected populations and the vulnerable to access assistance and protection – so-called 'humanitarian space' – is contracting as a result of this association with the military and, more specifically, political interest (Harmer, 2008; Stoddard, Harmer, DiDomenico, 2009). However, the belief that development and reconstruction activities are central to stability and security is not new and this shift in the perception of humanitarian efforts cannot therefore be attributed solely to its closer association with political aims. The need for 'integrated' approaches or 'coherence' in post-conflict environments has been largely acknowledged by humanitarian and military actors alike for some time, particularly in the aftermath of Rwanda and other humanitarian crises of the 1990s (Collinson et al, 2012). However, 'stabilisation' in foreign policy, military strategy, and development aid assumed significantly greater prominence after the events of 9/11 (Stoddard, 2009). Such approaches were highly contentious, perhaps nowhere more so than in Afghanistan where troop contributing nations (TCNs) to the International Security Assistance

Force (ISAF) sought to utilise development and reconstruction activities to undermine the Taliban, and enhance the legitimacy of the Afghan government (Haysom & Jackson, 2013).

Whether or not change in aid policy has resulted in greater mistrust and therefore increased risk of harm for aid workers, a perception remains in the humanitarian community that aid workers are at increased risk of attack or harm in the course of their work, and that this necessitates greater investment in the security and safety of employees (Stoddard, 2009). This sentiment has been reflected in the rhetoric of aid agencies, both internally and publically. This extract, taken from Irish Aid's introduction in their Security and Safety Guidelines (2012) reflects this:

A primary condition for sustainable and effective access, in particular in unstable and hostile environments, is safety and security. There can be no access if aid organisation employees do not benefit from some degree of protection that enables them to work, and be spared the excesses of violence, harassment or other hazards.

Data about attacks on aid workers is not always collected centrally or in a coordinated way, so it is difficult to get an accurate picture of the situation and the risk. However, of those recorded in 2012, 274 aid workers (this figure includes UN employees and volunteers as well as INGO and government funded aid and development workers) were killed, kidnapped or seriously injured in the course of their work (United Nations Secretary General, 2013). While the estimated rate of attacks on aid workers continued to rise compared with previous years (Harmer et al, 2013; United Nations Secretary General, 2013). Best estimates are that around 0.05% of aid workers are attacked each year (Harmer et al, 2013). The rate of aid workers involved in serious security incidents has risen year on year since data was first collected – except in 2010 in which there were slightly fewer incidents than in 2009 (Harmer et al, 2013).

Aid agencies have responded to threats by producing more policy and procedure, outlined in guideline documents, directing employees in security and safety measures.

CARE recognizes that effective safety and security policies and procedures are essential to promoting the safest possible working environment for CARE staff
CARE (2012)

Some organisations also require that employees complete training workshops before or upon arrival at a duty station. These sessions usually include security and safety briefings aimed at informing employees of how they can best keep themselves, and others they work with, safe while in the field. To date no research has been published into aid workers' own constructions of security, so there is little to which my findings can be compared. This work, therefore, represents the first such exploration of security in interaction, among aid workers.

Security is central to belonging in the context of aid work because belonging is seen as a route to improving the safety of aid workers in the field (Avant, 2007). In this chapter, therefore, I look closely at security and explore aid workers' constructions of security whilst in the field. I examine the aspects of security that are made problematic, and how this problem is constructed in interaction. Toward the end of the chapter I look at themes of belonging in aid workers' formulations of security and reflect on what we can learn about belonging as a practice from these interactional achievements. The interview extracts featured herein were chosen because they include instances where security is made relevant. The selected extracts were then examined to identify patterns in the interaction, and several of these were selected for more detailed analysis. In some extracts the interviewer asks a question about security while in others the participant makes relevant security in response to a question about another topic

In the analysis that follows I examine the ways in which participants treat security in the interviews. I access this construction through (1) sequence; the way a turn responds to a previous turn or projects the next one and (2) turn packaging, especially elaboration, specification and contrast which deal with particular contextually specific issues arising in the conversation. Out of this turn-by-turn analysis I identify and explore the conversational work being done.

MINIMISING THE SECURITY THREAT

In each of the following three extracts participants are asked directly about the “security threats” of the locations in which they lived or worked in the field. They each respond using similar discursive patterns; resisting any projection in the interviewer’s question that the threat of violence is a problem and using a comparison pair with another ‘more developed’ country to make the case that the location about which the interviewer has asked, is safe.

Extract 1

- 1 I: Yeah. So what about um, what about security and things where you
2 are, what’s that like, like what are the security threats, the main
3 security threats for you?
4 Rose: There aren’t any [recording breaks up a bit]
5 I: There what sorry?
6 Rose: There aren’t any, there really aren’t any in um during the elections, it
7 was a bit full on you just didn’t go out on the streets [recording breaks
8 up] there is aid workers are not [recording breaks up]
9 I: Oh hang on you’re cutting out so I can’t hear you
10 Rose: Oh I’m sorry, hang on, let me move the computer. Um aid workers are
11 not being targeted, there haven’t been any aid worker kidnappings in
12 a really long time, um you know, bag snatchers sure, but that happens
13 everywhere but its. I’m sure if I went walking around alone at night
14 something bad might happen to me, but I wouldn’t do that at home.
15 I: Yeah
16 Rose: I don’t think the threat level here is any higher than it was in the states

Extract 2

The interviewer's question occurs after the participant has explained she was not permitted to go out running in the evenings, or go to some locations by herself because of security restrictions in place by the organisation for which she worked.

- 1 I: And um what was the threat the security threat (.) so what would
2 happen if you went out (.) and did this?
- 3 Maria: Well ehuh I guess it depends on the country but um nnn nmm (..) nm
4 probably (...) nothing is my guess but um there were there were some
5 riots in some places that I was so there was fear of that (.) there was
6 fear of (.) so in Guinea there were riots so we were confined to our
7 hotel for a little bit in Colombia there was a fear of being kidnapped in
8 certain FARC controlled territories and para-military controlled
9 territories
- 10 I: Ihim
- 11 Maria: Um (...) that is (.) does that answer your question or?
- 12 I: Yeah yeah uh yeahp so (.) w what about um muggings murder rape
13 any of those were those also security fears that you that restricted your
14 movement or
- 15 Maria: That yeah that's interesting I (..) for (..) yes I I guess that's true but um
16 (...) yeah
- 17 I: Yeahp but [not to
- 18 Maria: I'm trying to think about how to explain this but yeah those are sort
19 of just normal risks associated with travel I think so absolutely there
20 would be (.) I mean in some countries that are like quote unquote very
21 secure I wouldn't go out alone at night for those reasons (.) just sort of
22 petty crime

Extract 3

- 1 I: Ok, ah what about security concerns, security or safety concerns.
- 2 Mary: Ihim, ah well eh mm Dominican Republic I was quite safe I would say.
3 It was my first mission so I was ah at the beginning you know I didn't
4 know ah exactly how to uh I didn't have a measure for prepareism so
5 at the beginning maybe uh, I was uh careful but then I realised quickly
6 that its a very safe country. I mean there is petty theft and petty
7 criminality like there is in every other country but eh nothing in
8 particular.

In each of these extracts the interviewer asks directly about threats to the participant's safety, in Extract 3: "what are the security threats, the main security threats for you" (lines 1-2), Extract 4: "what was the threat the security threat (.) so what would happen if you went out (.) and did this" (line 1-2) and Extract 5: "what about security concerns, security or safety concerns" (line 1). Rose does this in a straight forward way answering "there aren't any, there really aren't any" (line 5). Maria and Mary's answers are less direct; their responses attend to the fact they are not aligning with the interviewer's implication that there are security threats. Both begin their responses with "well" indicating they are producing a dispreferred answer, "well ehuh I guess it depends on the country but um nnn nmm (..) nm probably (...) nothing is my guess" (Extract 4, lines 3-4); "Ihim, ah well eh mm Dominican Republic I was quite safe I would say." (Extract 5, line 2). Each then elaborate on the stances they've produced eventually setting up a comparison pair between the country about which they are speaking, and some other 'more developed' country. These comparisons are designed to demonstrate that the threat of violence is no greater in the location they are in than most other countries. Rose compares 'here' with 'the states', where she is from "I don't think the threat level here is any higher than it was in the states" (line 15). Maria compares her current location to other countries considered secure "those are sort of just normal risks associated with travel I think so absolutely there would be (.) I mean in some countries that are like quote unquote very secure I wouldn't go out alone at night for those reasons (.) just sort of petty crime" (lines 15-18). Mary uses the same device acknowledging that while there is "petty theft and petty crime" she makes this universal by comparing this with other countries "I mean there is petty theft and petty criminality like there is in every other country but eh nothing in particular" (lines 5-6).

Each of the participants in the above three extracts, works to minimise threats to their safety, to render any suggestion in the interviewer's question that violence or

crime might be a problem as moot. In the following section however, I examine participants' construction of security as a problem, although, not the kind of problem that might be expected.

CONSTRUCTING THE PROBLEM

In the interviews security was made a complainable matter (Monzoni, 2008), sometimes this was projected in the interviewer's question, but at other times participants made relevant security and constructed it as a problem themselves. In this section I look at what aspect of security is made problematic, and how this is done in the interviews. The following extract occurs toward the end of the interview after the interviewer has announced her questions have been completed and enquires of the participant whether "there (was) anything that you wanted to ask me or anything that you wanted to add?". 33 lines of talk occur between the question and the part of Seb's response beginning at line one below. The intervening talk mostly concerns an issue raised by Seb: the UN's policy that "you're not allowed to transport anybody in your er in your big Jeep er who's not working for the UN".

Extract 4

- 1 Seb: Erm this is very important that people know that we can basically not
- 2 do this. The same with the whole security phases which are way
- 3 exaggerated I think so the UNDSS itself of course has all, erm, has all
- 4 importance of making the situation look much more dangerous than it
- 5 actually is
- 6 I: Yeah
- 7 Seb: Cause in many cases I, to be honest I have never really felt threatened,
- 8 though I did in some IDP camps when people are getting hungry, and
- 9 and it yeah people are traumatised and and totally yeah, some people
- 10 are imagine being a refugee for where you don't know if some of your
- 11 family you lost on the way is still alive or when you will be able to go
- 12 home if even still have a home etc
- 13 I: Yeah

- 14 Seb: Erm and then it can be very frightful when when in an IDP camp you
15 have to tell people listen the WFP truck er just broke down er 20
16 kilometres from here so there will be no food distribution today and
17 one guy starts agitating the crowd and its very scary er again its
18 suddenly the people you wanna work for and you you really want to
19 do well for could be your worst enemies as [well
20 I: <yeah>
21 Seb: so its full of contradictions this humanitarian aid work.

Extract 5 begins with Seb's summary of his previous turn's point at line one "erm this is very important that people know that we can basically not do this". Here 'this' relates to a behaviour to which he referred in his previous turn. Because of the proximity of the two references Seb does not need to name what he is referring to and treats it as understood by the interviewer.

Seb then draws a similarity between the situation he has just described and the point he is about to make saying "the same with the whole security phases" (line 2), although he is not explicit about what aspects are 'the same' and leaves this to the interviewer to interpret from his coming account. Seb elaborates by refining what the interviewer might understand about security phases at line two making relevant the degree to which they match the threat saying that they are "way exaggerated I think".

Seb marks a coming sensitive topic with 'so' (Bolden, 2006) at line three and continues "the UNDSS itself of course has all, erm, all the importance of making the situation look much more dangerous than it actually is" (line 4). Seb does not explain why UNDSS would "have all the importance of making the situation look much more dangerous" (lines 3-4), showing that he treats this as common knowledge with the interviewer. Lines two to four are offered as an explanation of why, as he claims immediately prior to this, security phases are "way exaggerated" (line 2). Here, "all the importance" is hearable as a motivation because it is followed

by agentic action; 'making the situation look' a particular way. This works as an explanation of and evidence for, by way of providing a reason, his earlier claim that security phases are "way exaggerated" (line 2).

Seb continues to undermine the relevance of security in his next two turns beginning at lines six and 13 respectively in which he works up the internally displaced persons (IDP) camp as the only place in which he had "felt threatened". This is a potentially powerful way of undermining aid organisations' security policies, usually designed to keep aid workers safe in the community, rather than in UN-run camps. By making the only real threat that posed by the very people he is there to help, he minimises the security threat and calls into question the focus on security measures designed to keep him safe when not at work.

By minimising the threat, except, on occasion, in IDP camps Seb works to undermine the legitimacy of the security protocols of the organisation by which he is employed, the UN. He attends to matters of stake and interest between lines one and four by suggesting the UN benefits from "making the situation look much more dangerous than it actually is", which provides the motivation for security protocols as something other than the threat of violence or danger, as one might otherwise expect. Seb has made security a problem here, however not the level of insecurity or threats to security, but rather security measures, which he claims, are "way exaggerated".

In Extract five below Diana responds to a question about security protocols from the interviewer by developing a construction of security as a problem in similar ways to Seb above.

Extract 5

1 I: Do you ever get warnings or anything from your organisation, have
 2 there been any security protocol warnings or anything in terms of
 3 what you [do?
 4 Diana: Oh] not allowed to go out past (.) midnight on weekends, not allowed
 5 to be in other people's cars, not allowed to walk arou I mean honestly I
 6 don't really listen to it
 7 I: Yup
 8 Diana: Now that my boss is living a now that my boss is living above me I
 9 have to abide by the curfew unless I can find somewhere to stay, but
 10 we just did whatever we wanted until she moved in a couple of
 11 months ago, I mean we just didn't listen to any of the warnings
 12 because they were just STUPID, I mean we know that no aid workers
 13 are being targeted for kidnapping it doesn't make sense that they
 14 would kidnap us because its harder for us to get money than it is for
 15 (.) locals. So um, you know, yeah we just didn't listen to it all we went
 16 out to parties we did yeah no problem

The interviewer's question is designed in such a way that a simple 'yes' or 'no' could be provided but the participant forgoes this in favour of an answer that offers more information. Lampropoulou and Myer's (2013) argue that a yes/no answer to a yes/no interrogative is not usually an adequate response in a research interview. Furthermore, Diana responds by making her own turn syntactically dependent on the interviewer's turn because "oh not allowed to go out past (.) midnight on weekends' would be strange if it were not preceded by the interviewers turn which provides the stance terms. By using the interviewer's turn the interviewee ties her turn to the interviewer's and displays that she is performing her part in the interview; the form of the turn is presented as a response to that question even if the content of the response is not that projected by the question (Lampropoulou & Myers, 2013).

Using a three-part list of security protocol warnings; "not allowed to go out past (.) midnight on weekends, not allowed to be in other people's cars, not allowed to walk arou" Diana develops the interview's understanding of the 'security protocol warnings' to which she is subject. This list is constructed with commas as divisions

between parts, with no 'and' announcing the third and final part as is the convention. Three-part lists act as exemplars of what is implied to be a much larger collection; the absence of the 'and' adds to the impression that the list has been truncated and that those parts named are just a small part of a larger group. The list, of course, is not finished because the final part is truncated midway through a word at line four "not allowed to walk arou" for Diana's upshot signalled by 'I mean honestly', "I don't really listen to it".

Diana elaborates on this claim that "I don't really listen to it" in lines seven-nine by showing a change in behaviour over time, initiated by the arrival of her boss "now that my boss is living above me I have to abide by the curfew unless I can find somewhere to stay, but we just did whatever we wanted until she moved in a couple of months ago". At lines nine and ten Diana goes on to account for her claim that 'I didn't really listen' by recycling this earlier construction with some modifications; replacing the pronoun 'I' with 'we', making the claim past tense rather than present - 'didn't' instead of 'don't' to fit with her account as changing over time - and dropping 'really' which constructed the behaviour as something not absolute and adding 'just' which works to further develop this behaviour as consistent and uncompromising; and rather than leaving the object of the claim implicit by referring to the object as 'it', in this recycled version Diana is explicit naming it as 'the warnings'. The reason Diana provides for not listening to 'it' or 'the warnings' is that "they were just STUPID" (line 10). Diana treats this as requiring explanation, so at the end of line 10 Diana begins her explication "I mean we know that no aid workers are being targeted for kidnapping it doesn't make sense that they would kidnap us because it's harder for us to get money than it is for (.) locals". This point provides effective evidence in support of her earlier stance about the risk of kidnap of international aid workers as very low. Not only does she claim it is rare, but, like Seb provides a rationale for her claim. Like Seb, Diana formulates the security protocols of the organisation for which she works as unreasonable. Both she and Seb work to make the problem with security, security

measures, rather than threat of crime or physical harm as might be expected. This pattern was observed throughout the interviews and in the following three sections I look at three ways in which security measures were constructed as problematic. While they each involve making security policies overly restrictive they differ in the way they do this.

SECURITY MEASURES AS LIMITING WORK

In the extract below Monica orients to, and makes relevant, security in her response to a question from the interviewer about another topic.

Extract 6

- 1 I: Ihim, ok. So em, considering, if you think about your time in
2 the field, and I realise every place will be slightly different, can
3 you describe for me what the main challenges were for you,
4 and if they're vastly different you could if you ehmm maybe
5 focus on your last experience in Afghanistan
6 Monica: Uh, yeah they're each incredibly different what the main
7 challenges were. In Afghanistan it was secu↑rity↓
8 I: Ihim
9 (2.5)
10 I: [Ok
11 Monica: Eh] In South Sudan I was in a very rural area so it was rustic
12 living conditions and being very much (..) uh how do I want to
13 say it (2) basically seeing all the statistics you know↓
14 I: Yeah
15 Monica: Because of the (inaudible) in the community (..) seeing high
16 morbidity and mortality relating to maternal health. Seeing ah
17 HIV prevalence, seeing pe e se infant mortality I [mean you see
18 it
19 I: Yeah ya]
20 Monica: And its very different than knowing it, reading about it, writing
21 about it
22 I: Ihim
23 Monica: Um but in Afghanistan because of the security situation, I mean
24 I was based in Kabul, our projects were (..) meant to be carried

25 out in very insecure districts in the South and the East (.) and
26 because of security I actually never even made it out there↑
27 I: Right

Monica begins her reply to the interviewer's question at line five by agreeing with the interviewer's assertion that the "main challenges" (line 3) might be different depending on where one is working "uh yeah, they're each incredibly different" making the statement her own by using "incredibly" rather than recycling the interviewer's "slightly" (line 2) or "vastly" (line 3-4). Monica states at line seven that "in Afghanistan it was security". Monica does not need to be explicit about what "it" is because in the interviewer's turn immediately prior, the topics of conversation are established as places and challenges: "if you think about your time in the field, and I realise every place will be slightly different, can you describe for me what the main challenges were for you" (lines 1-3). Monica has provided the place in the first part of the statement so "it" is hearable as referring to the second related topic. Her statement is straight forward, she provides no warrant or further explanation; the participant treats what she has just said as shared knowledge as she offers no account for why security should be a problem in Afghanistan (Roschelle & Teasley, 1995).

After a continuer from the interviewer, 'ihim' at line eight showing 'engaged listenership' (Lambertz, 2011; Schegloff, 1982), and a reasonably lengthy silence at line nine, which the participant treats as indicating she should elaborate, Monica develops a contrast pair (Baker, 2004) between South Sudan in lines 11-20 and Afghanistan which she has already introduced.

Monica's turn at line 10 begins with a description of the area in which she was living while in South Sudan "Eh] in South Sudan I was in a very rural area so". The "so" at the end of the statement announces the upshot coming in her next statement "it was rustic living conditions" which allows her to elaborate, providing further description of the place in which she lived making the living conditions the relevant

thing about the rural nature of the area in which she lived. The exact nature of the 'rustic living conditions' is left implicit, as Monica provides no further description. This indicates that 'rustic living conditions' is a category which Monica treats either as shared knowledge with the interviewer, or it is not important to the case she is building so exactitude is not necessary.

Monica continues by working up to the announcement of what becomes the 'proper' challenge with a rhetorical question at line 12 "uh how do I want to say it". This treats her coming claim "basically seeing all the statistics you know↓" as something delicate or potentially problematic. "Statistics" works as a kind of euphemism, and we might guess at what that means using 'common sense' knowledge, with the 'you know' on the end potentially a nod to shared knowledge with the interviewer (Stokoe, 2012).

However the interviewer provides no indication that she has understood "statistics" in the way the participant wants her to. So, at line 15, Monica goes on to specify to what she is referring: "high morbidity and mortality relating to maternal health. Seeing ah HIV prevalence, seeing pe e se infant mortality". This elaboration is useful to Monica's conversational goal because if the interviewer thinks that by "statistics" Monica is referring to, for example, soil erosion, no internet access in schools or limited public transport this might undermine her claim that "seeing all the statistics" was the 'main challenge' – because these 'statistics' aren't perhaps so terrible that seeing them works as a 'main challenge'. In this way Monica sets up South Sudan as a location and set of challenges to which Afghanistan can be compared. By citing the example of another location in which she experienced the main challenge to be something other than that which she named for Afghanistan (security) Monica also lends more credibility to her claim about Afghanistan – that the claim is dependent on the 'actual' situation rather than a particular issue she might have which would lead to her naming security as a challenge regardless of where she was and what the situation was 'really' like.

At line 21 Monica skip-connects to an earlier turn and revisits the topic of Afghanistan. A skip-connect, as identified by Harvey Sacks (1992), occurs when a speaker connects the current utterance to that of earlier talk allowing the participant to return to a previous topic. The “but” at the beginning of this turn (line 22) acts as the link between the two parts of her contrast pair and signals the beginning of the second part of the comparison. Monica uses a dispreferred construction (Clifton, 2012) placing the cause before the effect: “because of the security situation” (line 22 and repeated at line 24 without the “situation”), with the effect coming at the end of her turn after an insertion “I actually never even made it out there” (line 25).

The intervening lines provide the place to which she refers by ‘there’, and the problem that the “security situation” has caused. At lines 23 and 24 Monica begins the insertion by stating that she lived in Kabul and then provides the broad location of the districts in which their “projects were meant to be carried out”. She says “the South and the East” which is hearable not as directions from say Kabul but as locations because of the preface ‘the’. By using ‘the’, South and East become nouns, locatable entities in which the “insecure districts” lie. This could potentially cause confusion because the interviewer may not know whether Kabul also lies in “the South or the East”, however the participant treats this as something the interviewer will know and her later use of the phrase “out there” in line 25 when referring to those locations provides a hint that they are some distance from where she was living because of her proximal use of ‘there’. With this construction Monica has let us know that she had to travel in order to carry out her work without actually saying it, we are left to infer this from her description of the location of her places of work and living.

By working up the distance between where she was ‘based’ in comparison to where the ‘projects were meant to be carried out’ and her final claim in this extract that “I actually never even made it out there↑” Monica makes available the inference that

no work was done, although notably she doesn't say this. The reasons she gives for not being able to carry out her work is "security" (line 24) and "the security situation" (line 22). Positioning security as responsible for her not conducting any aid, when that is her job and presumably the only reason she is in Afghanistan, is a very effective way to construct security as a problem. Furthermore, if we consider Monica's construction using membership categorisation analysis her assemblage of security as a problem potentially becomes even stronger. Delivering aid might reasonably be considered a fundamental category bound activity for the category aid worker, so *not* doing aid work challenges that person's claim to the category aid worker. By extension an aid organisation employing aid workers who don't deliver aid is at best ineffective and at worst not an aid organisation. Therefore, if security prevents aid workers from getting to the places where their 'projects are meant to be carried out' (line 23) and by inference delivering aid, this helps build security as a complainable matter and further to construct security as a significant problem for aid workers.

Unlike Extract 6, in the following extract the interviewer, rather than the participant, introduces the topic of security.

Extract 7

- 1 I: So um w was security an issue for you when you were working in the
- 2 field?
- 3 Karen: Uh it became a it became an issue. It was uh I felt uh I felt mostly very
- 4 safe and I felt you know that you know the security measures and
- 5 where we could travel and all this was almost a bit too strict and
- 6 NGOs were much freer in their movements and that you know I had
- 7 to spend a lot more time in the office than I really wanted to

Karen responds to the interviewer's question with a part agreement at line two "uh it became a it became an issue", implying that while it was not an issue initially at some point this changed. This response provides a conditional answer to the

interviewer's question and works up a coming account. At this point two things are potentially unclear due to the vagueness of this initial response. The first is what Karen means by 'an issue' (line 2) and whether this aligns with what the interviewer means by 'an issue' (line 1); and the second is why 'it' *became* an issue. Karen elaborates beginning with a straight forward construction "it was" (line 2) then repairing this to "I felt" (line 2) which makes the coming claim subjective. This works to minimise the potential for the interviewer to challenge the participant on her claim, since the participant is clearly the authority on her own feelings however left as the former construction the interviewer might reasonably claim some authority to knowledge of the security situation in the place about which Karen is speaking, and challenge her on that basis (Heritage, 2005). This repair which attends to the potential for disagreement indicates that the participant treats the coming claim "I felt mostly very safe and I felt you know that you know the security measures and where we could travel and all this was almost a bit too strict" (lines 3-4) as potentially problematic.

Karen uses a three-part list to elaborate on her point that she 'felt mostly very safe' saying "I felt...the (1) security measures and (2) where we could travel and (3) all this was almost a bit too strict" (lines 3-4). Three part lists function as an exemplar of what is implied to be a larger group of characteristics or objects (Smith, 2011). Therefore, Karen's list of the ways security was 'too strict' (line 4) is hearable as numerous and not limited to just the few things she mentions, which builds the case for her claim.

The use of 'we' in "where we could travel" at line three indicates that the 'security measures' about which Karen is speaking apply to more people than just Karen, because the preposition has changed from 'I' (earlier in line 3), which she uses at the beginning of her turn, to 'we', as stated. Karen does not specify what this group is or who it includes – other than herself - and at this point she could be speaking about all aid workers in that location for example, or all women, or all water sanitation

consultants. However, she goes on to say “and NGOs were much freer in their movements”. This works to identify the category of people to whom she is referring at line three as aid workers working for a type of organisation other than an NGO. Sacks (1992) describes how this occurs using what he termed the ‘consistency rule’ which is that “if a category from some device’s collection has been used to categorise a first member of a population, then that category or other categories from the same collection may be used to categorise further members of the population” (p. 246). This links the NGOs to the group ‘we’ so that participants in the conversation, in this instance the interviewer, understand that the group ‘we’ is related in some way to NGOs. Members typically make a choice about which classificatory set is relevant to the current conversation, and in this instance it is hearable as types of aid organisations: NGOs, UN agencies, government organisations/agencies. So we understand from the way Karen has set up this turn that she does not work for an NGO, but for some other kind of organisation engaged in similar kinds of work to that of an NGO.

Having established two groups Karen now uses the second group NGO as a contrast pair to construct the ‘security measures’ and ‘where we could travel’ as ‘a bit too strict’, because the NGOs, which are part of the same category and by implication engaged in the same kind of work in the same location ‘are much freer in their movements’. This contrast makes available the inference that the security measures in the organisation for which Karen works are unreasonable or excessive.

Karen’s final claim in this extract at line five “I had to spend a lot more time in the office than I really wanted to” displays two meanings, one literal and the other implied but related to shared knowledge of aid work. In aid work office work is sometimes not considered ‘real aid work’, planning and organisation might occur in the office but delivering aid, of course, is done in the community. Getting to the office is generally easier and less of a risk than going to ‘the field’ so during times of unrest or increasing rates of violence aid workers are not able to go to communities

in which they work to deliver aid and must typically remain at the office, or sometimes in their accommodation. Karen's claim then at line five that "I had to spend a lot more time in the office than I really wanted to" is a reference not just to being in the office but to *not* being in the community. Furthermore, not being able to be out of the office and in the community makes available the inference that she was not able to get aid work done. Her having to spend longer in the office and by implication not getting aid work done is attributed to the 'security measures' and 'where we could travel' being 'a little bit strict' by the 'and' at the end of line four. Notably, like Monica in Extract 1, Karen does not say that she wasn't able to do her work; rather this is left implied.

Both Karen in Extract 2 and Monica in Extract 1 use contrast pairs, elaboration and implication, among other discursive devices, to develop security as a problem because it limits aid workers' ability to do aid work. Positioning security as responsible for their not delivering any aid, when that is their job is a very powerful way to construct security as problematic. Furthermore, if we consider Monica and Karen's constructions using membership categorisation analysis their assemblage of security as a problem potentially becomes even stronger. Delivering aid might reasonably be considered a fundamental category bound predicate for the category aid worker, so *not* doing aid work challenges that person's claim to the category aid worker (Watson, 1978). By extension an aid organisation employing aid workers who don't deliver aid is at best ineffective and at worst not an aid organisation. Therefore, if security prevents aid workers from getting to the places where their 'projects are meant to be carried out' (Extract 1, line 22) and by inference delivering aid, security becomes a big problem.

In the section below security is also constructed as restrictive, although the route used by participants to establishing security measures as problematically restrictive, is slightly different.

SECURITY MEASURES AS LIMITING EVERYDAY ACTIVITIES

In Extract 8 below, Maria makes relevant security in response to the interviewer's question about the challenges of working in the field.

Extract 8

- 1 I: Ihim, yeah. OK and so w eh w thinking about the day to day pra sort
2 of challenges of working in the field um w what did you find most
3 challenging or what were a couple of the challenging things?
4 Maria: There I mean the work itself is exhausting there is no separation
5 between work and um and like private life so no very little time off
6 you're just always or for like months on end you're in it (.) you live
7 and breathe it so (..) we (..) I don't know that was a challenge another
8 thing depending on where I was I found security to be a challenge (.)
9 not so much that I felt uncomfortable all the time but I really miss
10 doing the things that I could do at home like going out for a run or just
11 being able to take a long walk at night um a so I felt that I just by the
12 end I felt that everything was sort of oppressive and I couldn't move
13 about as freely as I wanted to and I think that's that was probably the
14 biggest challenge for me

The interviewer's question begins at line one with an acknowledgement of Maria's previous turn before continuing with "ok and so" as a preface to the question.

Bolden (2006) shows how 'so' at the beginning of a question acts as a discourse marker that typically introduces inferences about sensitive topics, so this signals that what is coming is treated by the interviewer as something potentially sensitive or problematic. The interviewer's coming formulation confirms this – there are three attempts and 'cancels' immediately after the "ok and so"; "w eh w" before the interviewer elects to proceed differently with "thinking about the day to day pra sort of challenges of working in the field um w what did you find most challenging". The interview then immediately offers an alternative formulation of a similar question "or what were a couple of the challenging things". The

interviewer's treatment of the question signals that this may be a sensitive or problematic topic.

Maria attends to the interviewer's construction by offering two 'challenging things', the first at line four "the work itself is exhausting" and the second at line eight "I found security to be a challenge". The participant constructs both the 'challenges' using the same three-part formulation: (1) she begins with a claim, (2) elaborates and specifies (3) then provides an upshot containing an extreme case formulation. The first of these begins at line four with the claim "the work itself is exhausting" then continues with an elaboration in which she specifies the aspect of the work that is exhausting "there is no separation between work and um and like private life" (lines 4-5). The 'so' at line five immediately following the end of her elaboration introduces an upshot "so no very little time off you're just always or for like months on end you're in it (.) you live and breathe it" (line 6). The extreme case formulation "you're just always" occurs at line five but is immediately repaired by Maria to "or for like months on end".

The second three-part construction of a challenge begins at line seven with the claim "depending on where I was I found security to be a challenge". Maria then elaborates and specifies what it is about security that she considers to be a challenge "not so much that I felt uncomfortable all the time but I really miss doing the things that I could do at home, like going out for a run or just being able to take a long walk at night um". Maria produces a problem about security, which, contrary to what might be expected, is not the threat of insecurity but rather the security measures to which aid workers are required to adhere. As in the example above, this specification is followed by 'so' signalling an upshot "I felt that I just by the end I felt that everything was sort of oppressive and I couldn't move about as freely as I wanted to". Again, as in her formulation of 'the work' as a challenge Maria uses an extreme case formulation to emphasise her point at line 11 saying that "I felt that *everything* was sort of oppressive".

Using this three-part construction Maria develops an account of her experience as an aid worker in which ‘the work’ and ‘security’ are constructed as challenges. In both of these accounts a simple statement like “depending on where I was I found security to be a challenge” is not treated by Maria as adequate because she goes on, as shown, to provide specification. This indicates that Maria herself orients to these claims as perhaps problematic or at least insufficient in the pursuit of her conversational goal.

In constructing security as a challenge Maria uses activities that might be considered mundane or ‘everyday’ that she is not now able to do, to construct security as “sort of oppressive” (lines 10-11); “going out for a run or just being able to take a long walk at night” (lines 9-10). By using mundane activities that others might ordinarily take for granted, security measures are worked up as unreasonably restrictive. In the extract below Monica produces a similar complaint about security, using the same device.

Extract 9

- | | | |
|----|---------|--|
| 1 | Monica: | So really the biggest challenge there was hhh (...) doing my |
| 2 | | best to maintain my sanity, with such a restrictive (...) uh |
| 3 | | secu↑rity↓ policies |
| 4 | I: | ok .hh |
| 5 | Monica: | I had never lived anywhere where I felt so isolated from the |
| 6 | | population that I was living with, theoretically. I lived in an |
| 7 | | armed compound, with my colleagues, with my international |
| 8 | | expat colleagues, and across the street I walked across the street |
| 9 | | with armed guhhards watching me to go to my office which |
| 10 | | was also, um you know had armed guards and Hesco walls and |
| 11 | | barbed wire and hhh heh |
| 12 | I: | Yeah |
| 13 | Monica: | People were searched or scanned for (.) for bombs before |
| 14 | | coming in, my only interaction with Afghans was in the office. |
| 15 | | You know there was no walking to the shop to get your own |

16 groceries or, heading out to the bazar and I mean, making
17 friends was I I mean forget it

This extract begins with an upshot “so really the biggest challenge was” (line 1). The “so” at the outset, in this instance, acting to construct the coming claim as a consequence of a former claim or description. The upshot contains a claim about the effect of security policies; that she was “doing (her) best to maintain (her) sanity, with such a restrictive (...) uh secu↑rity↓ policies” (lines 1-2).

The interviewer’s response at line three “ok .hh” works as a standard response in a social science interview in which the interviewer is ‘doing’ disengaged researcher. However, this acknowledgment does not provide the kind of conversationally appropriate response that might be expected after a statement like Monica’s immediately prior turn in which she describes the effect of ‘restrictive security policies’ as impacting on her sanity. Perhaps because of this minimal response Monica goes on to make a further statement about affect saying “I had never lived anywhere where I felt so isolated from the population that I was living with, theoretically” (line 4-5). She uses an extreme case formulation ‘I had never lived’ to load the statement, perhaps in pursuit of an empathetic and more typically conversationally appropriate response from the interviewer. Monica constructs a complainable matter (Monzoni, 2008) here; that she “felt so isolated from the population that I was living with, theoretically” (line 4-5). In this statement the problem she is constructing is the effect: feeling isolated, in relation to a specific group of people “the population I was living with” (lines 4-5). Monica uses a third person referent “the population” which creates discursive distance between her and the group of people about which she is speaking (Jackson, 2013). Monica further constructs herself as isolated from “the population” by adding ‘theoretically’ to the end of her statement at line five. This modifies her earlier statement about “the population” as people “I was living with” but from whom she felt isolated, to people she was not *actually* living with, which bolsters her claim to feeling isolated.

This section of Monica's turn works up her account of "the restrictive (...) uh secu↑rity↓ policies" and the way these made her feel "isolated from the population". She does this by providing specifics about the living arrangements "I lived in an armed compound" and the people with whom she *did* live using a same-turn self-initiated repair from "colleagues" to "international expat colleagues". Both of these attend to her isolation – living separated in a compound and with international rather than local colleagues. Again, as Maria did above, Monica has formulated the problem about security as the measures to which she was required to adhere, which left her isolated, rather than the threat of violence or harm.

In the final part of her turn Monica attends to the issue of security but rather than referring to security as she does in line two "secu↑rity↓ policies" Monica uses a three-part list of category bound 'attributes' to infer the category 'security': "had armed guards and Hesco walls and barbed wire and hhh heh" (line 9). This functions also to work up her daily life there as exceptional – Hesco walls, armed guards and barbed wire as well as "armed guhhards watching (her) to go to (her) office" – are not typically category attributes of everyday, mundane, usual life. Monica's account continues after the interviewer's "yeah" at line 12 "people were searched or scanned for (.) for bombs before coming in, my only interaction with Afghans was in the office" which functions to further construct life there as exceptional or highly unusual. Monica then elaborates and provides an account of the personal implications of these exceptional circumstances "you know there was no walking to the shop to get your own groceries or, heading out to the bazar and I mean, making friends was I I mean forget it". "Get(ing) your own groceries, heading out to the bizarre" and "making friends" might be considered everyday activities. These contrast starkly when juxtaposed with her description of the reality of her everyday life at lines nine to ten "armed guards and Hesco walls and barbed wire", supporting her construction of her everyday life as exceptional, and the security measures as extreme. Like Maria above, Monica makes available the

implication that even the most basic and mundane features of life are made impossible because of “such a restrictive (...) uh secu↑rity↓ policies”.

In the following section participants use similar constructions to make security a problem. Rather than limiting everyday life or their ability to do their work however, in the extracts in this section participants formulated security measures as problematic because of their impact on aid workers' belonging.

SECURITY MEASURES AS LIMITING BELONGING

In this section, I look at two extracts in which participants orient to belonging in discussion of security. In both of the extracts neither belonging nor security is made relevant by the interviewer's question, which in each case is about a topic other than belonging or security.

Extract 10

- 1 I: In general what do you think that communities that you were working
2 with thought about you and aid workers?
3 (3 secs)
4 Habib: Well I I used to ah (.) ah (.) call ourselves in Congo like the new
5 colonial people (...) that's a bit harsh hah and it's a bit eh exaggerated
6 (..) but I was looking at it (.) well we used to stay eh in Congo in these
7 compounds eh you know with barbed wires and (..) guards and it
8 used to be the old ah Belgian colonial mansions in ah (..) in Congo (.)
9 and then we have to drive these big cars in convoys and sometimes
10 we're eh (.) having ah (..) erm (..) escorts and stuff (..) so I think it's it
11 wasn't really good sometimes (..) eh (.) well eh when you have high
12 security levels (.) then the local population and then you will have this
13 eh (..) counter measures against eh eh security issues (..) then the
14 people will (.) not be able to accept you

The lengthy pause between the end of the interviewer's question and the beginning of Habib's reply indicates that the participant treats the question as in some way

problematic. Until later though, we do not know in what way the question presents Habib with cause to delay his response, so I return to this later in the analysis. Habib begins his response at line four with 'well' which acts as a conversational marker to indicate the coming of what might be considered a dispreferred response (Myers & Lampropoulou, 2013). Habib then offers a stance on the matter by reporting what he used to call himself and other aid workers, which he refers to collectively as 'ourselves': "Well I I used to ah (.) ah (.) call ourselves in Congo like the new Colonial people". In this context 'ourselves' is hearable as he and other aid workers because they have already been named as subjects in the interviewer's question. This stance is constructed as a comparison pair in which 'ourselves' and 'colonial people' make up the two parts of the pair (Heritage, 2005). Using shared knowledge, we might presume that a comparison with colonial people is intended as a negative, rather than positive, comment on a group. However, we can also see from the context of the conversation that the comparison is meant as negative because of Habib's assessment at line five "that's a bit harsh", indicating he is using the term as a negative rather than positive comparison. By providing this evaluation Habib also immunises against a critical response from the co-participant, the interviewer, that his assessment is overly harsh thereby avoiding having to provide a 'second assessment' or 'stance follow' to manage a co-participant's critique (Heritage & Raymond, 2005). The 'but' which follows the end of his evaluation at line five works to allow Habib to offer an opposing argument to his immediately prior statement and to continue to develop his construction of aid workers as 'the new colonial people'.

The participant formulates this elaboration as a considered position; an issue about which he has committed some previous thought, by prefacing his coming comparison with "but I was looking at it" at lines five to six. Habib renames the location as the Congo and then specifies by providing the type of accommodation in which they lived as "these compounds", referring to shared knowledge with "you know", he names the most salient aspects of the compounds to his construction

“with barbed wires and (..) guards”. Habib provides these particular category-bound-attributes (Radburn & Horsley, 2011) of compounds because they orient to the aspect of compounds which will work best in the conversation in order to achieve his construction of aid workers as “like the new colonial people”. Other category bound attributes that might not work as well might be that they rarely have gardens, or residents often share bathroom facilities, or that it can be hard to find a parking space if friends come to visit because they are enclosed. These are also potentially category bound attributes of compounds but the wrong attributes for Habib’s purposes, which shows he has a particular goal to which ‘barbed wire’ and ‘guards’ are relevant. He then adds further information that supports his comparison of aid workers with ‘colonial people’ “and it used to be the old ah Belgian colonial mansions in ah (..) in Congo”. This is a potentially powerful point of comparison; the aid workers living in the very buildings constructed and inhabited by ‘colonial people’.

Habib uses a three-part list (Drew, 1990) at lines eight to 10 to further develop his construction of aid workers as ‘the new colonial people’: “and then we have to drive these big cars in convoys and sometimes we’re eh (.) having ah (..) erm (..) escorts and stuff (..)”. Notably Habib describes only what aid workers do; he does not describe what colonial people did. This is treated by Habib as knowledge the interviewer is likely to already have. In addition, each of the ways in which Habib constructs aid workers as similar to colonial people could be considered as related to security: ‘barbed wires’ (line 8), ‘compounds’ (line 8), ‘guards’ (line 8), ‘big cars’ (line 9), ‘convoys’ (line 9) and ‘escorts’ (line 9).

Having completed his two part comparison the participant provides a stance in the form of an upshot signalled by the ‘so’ at line 10 “so I think it’s it wasn’t really good sometimes (..)”. Because this upshot follows immediately his list of behaviour by aid workers, ‘it’ is hearable as a reference to that behaviour, and the statement as a stance on the security measures he used to construct that behaviour. His adverbial

'really' and modifier 'sometimes' at line 10 work to soften what would otherwise be a bold statement 'I think it wasn't really good sometimes'. This moderation of the statement indicates that Habib treats this stance as potentially problematic, mirroring his 'well' at line four as pointed out at the outset of this section of analysis. At this point we could deduce that claiming security measures - such as living in compounds, guards and convoys - are not 'good' is what he treats as problematic. This attends to the possibility that a claim such as that is contrary to what the interviewer might ordinarily expect; for example, that security measures are positive because they protect aid workers from harm.

Up until this point in Habib's turn he has worked up a stance; that the convoys, big cars, guards and compounds "(weren't) really good sometimes" (line 10). This claim is treated as potentially problematic and we see further evidence of this because Habib goes on, at line 10, to elaborate by providing a reason for his stance in the form of an if/then statement "well eh when you have high security levels (.) then the local population and then you will have this eh (..) counter measures against eh eh security issues (..) then the people will (.) not be able to accept you". Here Habib makes explicit security for the first time this turn, confirming that the relevant category linking the conduct of aid workers he listed earlier – convoys, compounds and guards for example – is security and in particular 'high security levels'. The problem with 'high security levels' as he constructs it, is that "the people will (.) not be able to accept you" (line 13). Here 'the people' is hearable as local people and 'you' as aid workers. So having worked up 'security measures' as a problem Habib is now explicit about what kind of problem – that it prevents aid workers from being accepted by local people. Habib has oriented to security measures as impacting negatively on aid workers' belonging in local communities. His earlier use of a comparison with colonial people further bolsters this construction, as colonisers by their very definition were not locals, nor did they 'belong'.

In the extract below Seb responds to the last question on the interviewer's schedule. This tract of the interview occurs immediately after Seb has asked the interviewer about the department in which she is studying toward her PhD. The interviewer responds that she is studying in the psychology department and there is some brief discussion of this.

Extract 11

- 1 I: Ok yeah. Alright well that comes to the end of all my questions erm,
2 was there anything that you wanted to ask me or anything that you
3 wanted to add?
- 4 Seb: There's a few, yeah there's a few other things I could mention that are
5 really psychologically very important so you would see people taking
6 the mini busses and then i h i i if you go to the bars the local, your
7 friends they would ask like why are you guys such egoists you know
8 'cause we stand there in the cold and the rain and we saw we see all
9 those empty UN cars driving us by you know
- 10 I: Yeah
- 11 Seb: Never give us a lift, why is that. It's such a bad bad so the the UN
12 really needs to do lots more in terms of public information and and
13 mass information campaigns about why we cannot just give people a
14 lift, which is in Congo, is the most natural thing to do if you have a
15 pickup and you stop at a red light people will just jump in your
16 pickup and just jump out the next red light. So I was driving myself
17 many times with a pickup a Landcruiser pickup so it's like fuck!
18 Sometimes people jumped in to my pickup and then I just have to stop
19 and say guys please get out of my pick up, I cannot do this you know
20 if if somebody sees me I really I will have trouble for this.

The interviewer's question is a yes/no interrogative, but as is common in research interviews a simple yes/no response is not treated as adequate (Lampropoulou & Myers, 2013) and so Seb responds with an affirmation 'yeah' at line four couched amid information about the number of 'things' he 'could mention'; "there's a few, yeah there's a few other things I could mention" (line 4). He provides a reason for his raising these particular 'things' before he names them "(the things) are really

psychologically very important” making them relevant to what he perhaps assumes is the interviewer’s research agenda.

At line five Seb embarks on an account of an experience that is constructed using a script formulation ‘you would’ which makes the occurrence typical or expected (Edwards, 1994). He begins by describing what one might ordinarily see; “you would see the people taking mini buses” (line 5) and then describes what might typically occur in a hypothetical situation; “if you go to the bars” (line 6). Seb uses reported speech which makes an implicit claim to epistemic authority and lends the account an air of authenticity or accuracy that might be lacking in a straight forward account (Clift, 2006); “the local, your friends they would ask like why are you guys such egoists you know cause we stand there in the cold and the rain and we saw we see all those empty UN cars driving us by you know” (lines 8-9). Here Seb develops a complainable matter by providing the interviewer with a reported description of the *affect* of the problem, rather than the problem itself, that is, as an aid worker ‘your (hearably local) friends’ consider you ‘egoists’ because you drive by them in empty UN cars. Notably Seb has not named the problem, but rather described the effect – the result of the problem – leaving the problem itself, implied.

Seb follows the quoted speech with an assessment at line 11, which is then abandoned part way through in favour of a stance statement about the conduct of the UN “it’s such a bad bad so the the UN really needs to do lots more in terms of public information and and mass information campaigns about why we cannot just give people a lift”. Having provided this stance Seb elaborates by unpicking the statement explaining that giving people ‘a lift’ in Congo “is the most natural thing to do”. He illustrates this with a script formulation (Edwards, 1994) constructed as an if/then statement about what would ordinarily happen at line 14 “if you have a pickup and you stop at a red light people will just jump in your pickup and just jump out the next red light”. The two ‘justs’ suggesting to the listener that the action of jumping in and out of a pickup should be heard as simple and

unproblematic. As a contrast Seb then provides a description of his own typical experience presented as a script by the introduction of the action as something that occurred 'many times' (Edwards, 1994). In this construction what was earlier a simple matter is made frustrating, displayed by the exclamation "it's like fuck!" at line 17. His own action of stopping and asking people to get out of the pickup is formulated as something he *must* do rather than something he *wants* to do at line 18 "I just have to", making it something he does against his better judgment. Seb uses reported speech to conclude his turn "*guys please get out of my pick up, I cannot do this you know if if somebody sees me I really I will have trouble for this*" (lines 18 & 19) in which he presents himself as reluctantly adhering to the rules, yet reasonable and friendly as he goes about it.

Much like the participants featured in other extracts in this chapter, in this turn, Seb has produced a complainable matter (Monzoni, 2008), in which security measures are constructed as the problem, rather than security threats, as we might typically expect. The particular problem constructed by Seb is that UN security policy prohibits aid workers from engaging in everyday, typical activities in Congo; that is, allowing people to take lifts on the back of your pickup truck. This, according to Seb, results in misunderstanding and tension between local people and aid workers, setting them apart from the community. This is hearable as an issue related to belonging because of the categories "local" (line 6) and "you guys" which orient to 'localness' as the most salient thing about these groups which makes them different. Disrupting an aid worker's ability to engage in normal behaviour, thereby setting them apart from locals, is presented as a problem in itself indicating that fitting in is a desirable or even necessary end in itself.

CONCLUSIONS

In this final analytic chapter, I examined participants' discussion of security in relation to the work they do in the field as international aid workers. A general

analysis of security in the interviews was conducted because of its significance to belonging in the security literature on which many aid organisations base their security strategies. The analysis was focused on participants' treatment of security in the interviews, and on their subsequent constructions of those treatments. Security was universally treated as a complainable matter by participants, whether made relevant by the interviewer in her questions, or by the participant in response to a question about something else. When the interviewer asked directly about threats to safety and security, such as kidnap or rape, participants worked to minimise the risk implied in the question, using comparison pairs with other countries to make comparatively safe the location in which they were living and working. Perhaps unexpectedly, participants did not make inadequate security, or security threats, the problem, but rather 'too much' security, which as demonstrated in the second analytic section in this chapter entitled 'Constructing the Problem'. In pursuit of achieving this, participants formulated security measures employed by the organisations for which they worked as overly restrictive, and used three routes to realising this construction: by making security measures so restrictive they prevent aid workers from 1) doing their work 2) doing everyday activities and 3) doing belonging. In each of the remaining three analytic sections I examined one of these types of construction respectively.

Making security measures the problem, particularly when the interviewer projects threats rather than measures as a potential problem in her question, seems counterintuitive. It is certainly at odds with humanitarian security literature, in which these measures are formulated as imperative both in order to keep aid workers safe and to allow them to do their jobs effectively. Indeed, as detailed in this extract from the introduction to this chapter, Irish Aid claim that there can be no access nor work done if aid workers are not protected from "violence, harassment and other hazards".

A primary condition for sustainable and effective access, in particular in unstable and hostile environments, is safety and security. There can be no access if aid

organisation employees do not benefit from some degree of protection that enables them to work, and be spared the excesses of violence, harassment or other hazards.

Yet participants in this study turned that construction on its head, as such, making the safety and security measures, deemed necessary by Irish Aid, as the factor preventing them from doing their jobs. Formulating security as preventing aid work being done, when that is an aid worker's job, is a very powerful way to construct security as a problem. Furthermore, if we consider such constructions using membership categorisation analysis (Schegloff, 2007), delivering aid might reasonably be considered a fundamental category bound predicate of the category aid worker. *Not* doing aid work, therefore, challenges a person's claim to the category aid worker (Watson, 1978). By extension an aid organisation whose employees don't deliver aid is at best ineffective and at worst not an aid organisation. Therefore, if security prevents aid workers from getting their work done, and by inference delivering aid, security measures become a big problem.

Participants also made security measures problematic because it prevented them from doing everyday activities such as shopping, running or socialising with local people. This construction appeared to perform two functions. The first, to make the measures look particularly restrictive because they prevented aid workers from engaging in even the most mundane aspects of everyday life, and the second to bolster claims of stress experienced as a result of their work, which was attributed to overly restrictive security precautions. Interestingly, not one participant said that they felt threatened by violence, even when they had been the subject of violent or harassing behaviour by local people. It may be that the interactional consequences or interpersonal implications of such claims about local people or the threat of violence render such complaints interactionally ineffective. Perhaps, as discussed in the first chapter, these claims reflect poorly on the participant producing those claims and engender third or fourth turn stances to be produced in the face of possible objections by co-participants. Indeed, the only occasion on which a

participant described feeling unsafe was while carrying out his work in a UN internally displaced persons' (IDP) camp, in extract four.

The third way in which security measures were constructed as too restrictive was to make them so restrictive that they impacted on aid workers' ability to be accepted or to fit in, in the places in which they lived and worked. This is hearable as about belonging, given that fitting in and being accepted are generally considered aspects of belonging (Baumeister & Leary, 1995). Belonging was treated as straightforwardly and obviously desirable. That is, participants did not account for, or provide further elaboration in order to make belonging into a desirable outcome; it was treated as a 'taken-for-granted' shared position with the interviewer. On this basis participants were able to construct a complaint about security measures based on their negative impact on aid workers' ability to belong or fit in. In both instances fitting in was constructed as requiring aid workers to behave in ways similar to locals; allow people to catch a ride on the back of one's pickup truck (extract 11) or avoid driving in convoys with military escorts (extract 10). Both of these behaviours were prohibited by security policy, and this formed the basis of the problem constructed about security measures. Belonging was treated, as argued in the second chapter, as, at least in part, grounded in behaviour. A prerequisite of achieving belonging, it would seem, is that one does what others in the group do. Failing this, precludes acceptance, and therefore belonging. This has implications for belongingness literature, which treats belonging as a feeling or internal state – both in the individual who belongs (or does not) and the individual members of the group (Anant, 1967; Baumeister & Leary, 1995; Hagerty, Lynch-Sauer, Patusky, Bouwsema & Collier, 1992). These findings suggest that belonging is at least partly located in the semiotics of kinaesthetics, whereby our bodies produce meaning through interaction with others and this both achieves and displays our belonging.

Chapter 7: Discussion

The 'journey' of writing a thesis – to use an overused trope – is not always straightforward. And my journey may have been more convoluted than most. When I set out to conduct the research I undertook to interview aid workers, and adopt a data-led approach to the analysis. In doing so the findings developed over years of reading and rereading, discussion, debate and repeated rewritings and reformulations of my analysis of the data. This process often feels like panning for gold; what starts as a large slosh of muddy water, with much cajoling and careful agitation, slowly either reveals a nugget of gold insight that can be added to the pile of insights forming themes or findings, or runs out to nothing. Through a process such as this, you must deal with the topics in the data as you find them. In the analysis of my data, those nuggets of insight combined to form an overarching theme of belongingness, and so that is the central theme of the thesis. After review of the literature, I found that the way belonging was treated in participants' accounts, differed from the way in which it is often treated in psychology. As a psychologist, my primary interest was this disparity, and in respecifying belongingness and the way in which it is conceptualised in psychological research and treatment. If this had been my aim from the outset, I might have chosen a different source of data – such as recordings of actual laboratory experiments so that I could interrogate the ways that belongingness is constructed and negotiated in these 'artificial' contexts. Because I adopted a data-led approach I was rather left with a situation in which the theme that became most salient might have been better studied using a different set of data. As such, I achieved a respecification of a particular view of belonging in psychology, but arguably at the expense of a

grounded exploration of aid workers' belonging practices. The two necessarily produce a tension in the thesis that is not fully resolvable. It is perhaps unfortunate for the thesis; however, like most PhDs, this was also a learning experience, and has resulted in learnings for me about navigating epistemology in discursive research. Therefore, in this final chapter, I do not revisit the literature reviewed earlier in the thesis and consider that in light of the results of my research as is typical of most PhD theses. Rather, I review the main results, discuss some of the potential limitations, reflect on alternative ways of conducting the research, suggest areas for future research, and draw together final conclusions.

SUMMARY OF MAIN RESULTS

The first empirical chapter was focused on aid workers' discussion of belonging in relation to the local communities in which they lived and worked while out in 'the field'. It was found that participants did not provide straightforward accounts, rather they worked up constructions of belonging in particular ways to provide richer and lengthier formulations of their efforts to belong. These longer accounts about belonging occurred even when talk of belonging was volunteered; made relevant by the participant, rather than elicited by a question from the interviewer. Participants, therefore, did not treat belonging as straightforward, but rather a practice for which an account was interactionally necessary. As noted in the first analytic chapter, not one participant claimed to have achieved a sense of belonging in the community in which they worked. Each constructed an account of not belonging, formulating this as normal and expected. Participants managed issues of blame and accountability by working up their trying; recounting behaviours and strategies used in order to try to fit in and be accepted (deKok & Widdicombe, 2008). Failure to belong was attributed to contextual factors such as the nature of aid workers' placements (for example as too short), essential differences between locals and foreigners (such as differences in appearance) and local perceptions of aid workers (as wealthier and more privileged). Belonging was constructed as a project

into which much time and effort was invested, but that was ultimately unachievable because of contextual realities beyond aid workers' control. Participants used appeals to essentialist notions of difference, as well as local communities' immutable perceptions of aid workers, to manage potential issues of blame and accountability for not being accepted.

Evidence from this study, presented in the first analytic chapter, also supports theorists who have argued for a link between identity and belonging (Cohen, 1982; Fail, Thompson & Walker, 2004; Kiely, Bechhofer & McCrone, 2005). Participants oriented to issues of identity when talking about belonging, and made these relevant in the interaction for the purposes of self-construction. Whether talk of belonging was volunteered or elicited, participants preceded this talk with information that made available positive inferences that could be drawn about themselves. This process of self-construction worked to counter the potentially negative consequences of the belongingness talk to come, in which participants detailed their failure to be accepted by locals. It is not clear, from this data, the nature of the relationship between identity and belonging, but there is evidence to support a link.

In the second analytic chapter, I examined one strategy participants described using to achieve belonging in local communities; dress. Dressing for belonging was not treated as straightforward; participants argued both for and against changing the way one dresses, often in the same interview. The kind of dress participants described adopting was typically one or two items of clothing that they constructed as meaningful to the local population, such as a head covering or wrap; or a way of dressing that followed local conventions of dress such as covering one's legs or shoulders. Results from this analysis provided several insights into the practice of belonging as managed in interview interactions. The first of which is that belonging was positioned as a mediating factor between a strategy, in this case the way one dresses, and achieving a particular goal. The goals participants formulated as dependent on belonging in the interviews related to security and quality of work. In

their accounts, participants treated clothing as a tool through which they could operationalise certain strategies for acceptance. For example, wearing a head scarf, although not treated as religiously significant to participants, was reported as being worn in order to fit in, or draw less attention to oneself. Participants sometimes made it clear that this was done for pragmatic reasons only, and so clothing was constructed as a resource for doing belonging in a context in which one might not ordinarily easily belong.

Participants also made relevant gender in their discussion of clothing. This was typically done in reference to the end goal of security, rather than for ease of working. Women were constructed as targets for attention and therefore violence from, usually in these constructions, local men. One way of minimising or avoiding this threat was to dress in such a way as to reduce the likelihood of being noticed, which would in turn decrease the likelihood of assault. This finding is potentially more meaningful for the field of aid work than the study of belonging. This construction is troubling, given that it mirrors victim-blaming rhetoric, in which women are frequently called to account, or held responsible for 'provoking' violence committed against them by men through the way they dress, where they go or who they associate with (Butler, 2011; Gavey, 2013). Notions of cultural relativism are sometimes used to defend gendered practices, such as requirements of dress. However recent scholarly work in this area argues against the use of cultural relativism as a defence for such practices (Chakrabarty, 2009; Harrison, 2003). Cultural relativist arguments are associated with paternalistic colonialism, which reifies as 'original' the practices of 'less developed' cultures, particularly those aspects that further the interests of colonisers (Chakrabarty, 2009; McEwan, 2001). Culturally relativist arguments were both used and resisted in the interviews, often by the same participant. Aid organisations should be mindful to disrupt understandings of women, whether apparently culturally based or not – both aid workers and locals – that ultimately work to marginalise one group (women) while benefitting another (men).

One potentially important finding from the analysis is that rather than treating belonging as binary, as it is in current theoretical literature, in practice, participants treated belonging as a scale, or continuum. Participants spoke of, and contrasted, different levels of belonging. These levels ranged from simply demonstrating respect for a group, to 'not being noticed', through 'blending in' and finally 'being accepted'. This represents a marked shift in the way in which belonging is conceived of, and for the study of belonging in the future. Evidence from this study suggests that, in practice, efforts to belong do not result in one of two binary outcomes, but rather a position on a continuum of belonging.

In the final analytic chapter, I examined participants' references to security in their accounts of belonging (or not belonging). Security was universally treated as a complainable matter. Perhaps unexpectedly, however, participants did not make inadequate security, or security threats, the problem, but rather 'too much' security. In pursuit of achieving this, participants formulated security measures employed by the organisations for which they worked as overly restrictive, and used three routes to realising this construction: by making security measures so restrictive they prevent aid workers from 1) doing their work 2) doing everyday activities and 3) doing belonging.

This construction of security measures as the problem, is at odds with humanitarian security literature, in which these measures are formulated as imperative both in order to keep aid workers safe and to allow them to do their jobs effectively. Formulating security as preventing aid work being done, when that is an aid worker's job, is a very powerful way to construct security as a problem. Furthermore, if these constructions are examined through the lens of membership categorisation analysis (Schegloff, 2007), delivering aid might reasonably be considered a fundamental category bound predicate of being an aid worker. *Not* doing aid work, therefore, challenges a person's claim to the category aid worker

(Watson, 1978). By extension an aid organisation whose employees don't deliver aid is at best ineffective and at worst not an aid organisation.

Making security measures problematic because it prevented them from doing everyday activities such as shopping, running or socialising with local people was another formulation participants used to construct security as problematic. Perhaps counter-intuitively, not one participant said that they felt threatened by violence, even when they had been the subject of violent or harassing behaviour by local people. It may be that the interactional consequences or interpersonal implications of such claims about local people or the threat of violence render such complaints interactionally ineffective and so they are not offered.

The third way in which security measures were constructed as too restrictive was to make them so restrictive that they impacted on aid workers' ability to be accepted or to fit in, in the places in which they lived and worked. This is hearable as about belonging, given that fitting in and being accepted are generally considered aspects of belonging (Baumeister & Leary, 1995). Belonging was treated, as argued in the second chapter, as, at least in part, grounded in behaviour. A prerequisite of belonging, it would seem, is that one does what others in the group do. Security measures required of aid workers that disrupt this, were constructed as negatively impacting on aid workers' chances of belonging. This has implications for belongingness literature, which frequently treats belonging as a feeling or internal state – both in the individual who belongs (or does not) and the individual members of the group (Anant, 1967; Baumeister & Leary, 1995; Hagerty, Lynch-Sauer, Patusky, Bouwsema & Collier, 1992). These findings suggest that belonging is at least partly located in the semiotics of kinaesthetics, whereby our bodies produce meaning through interaction with others and this both achieves and displays our status as belonging.

METHODOLOGICAL CONTRIBUTIONS

This study adds to other studies demonstrating that the use of internet-based calling software such as Skype to conduct research interviews is both practical and effective. The concerns I had about the use of Skype were that it may be such a novel method of interviewing that both the participants and I found it strange or uncomfortable, perhaps it would be difficult to develop a rapport with participants so that they feel they can speak freely in the interview, and then technical issues like cutting out or dropped calls might make the process disjointed and frustrating. It was partly for this reason that I conducted a pilot study; to test my concerns. My experience however, was very different. We are, most of us, used to speaking on the phone and the conversation very quickly felt much like a phone call. Although easier, because it was not necessary to hold a receiver which left hands free to gesticulate and help with thought, even if the other person was not able to see those gestures.

We had very few technical glitches, there was just one occasion on which the call cut off, and I was able to call the participant straight back and resume the interview. People's speech was interrupted by interference very infrequently, and on those occasions I would just ask the participant to repeat what they said, which is not unusual in conversation held in places where there might be infrequent noise for example, so again, this felt quite 'natural'. Indeed, the quality was generally such that the technology was invisible in the conversation.

One potential advantage of using Skype instead of face-to-face interviews is that in the later analysis of the transcriptions; that which appears on the page, is or in the audio, is the full information that was available to each participant during the interaction. In traditional face-to-face interviews (without the use of a video camera) non-verbal communication that is available in the interaction is not recordable and therefore not available in the transcript which forms the basis of later analysis. Such non-verbal communication may include hand gestures, facial expressions,

movements about the room and even clothing worn that might make relevant particular identities in the interaction. Therefore, if, as a participant, I want to convey an impression of myself as friendly I cannot rely on smiles, nodding and an interested and attentive facial expression when using audio-only Skype, I must make that information audibly available somehow, and therefore that work is then recorded and available in the transcript. Whereas when using a traditional interviewing method, some of that work might be lost because it is done outside of what is recorded. In fact, some researchers using discursive analyses now use video data in order to capture just these non-verbal actions that are missing from traditional audio-only recordings (Brown, McGregor, & Laurier, 2013; Knoblauch, Baer, Laurier, Petschke & Schnettler, 2008; Laurier, 2010).

The video function is of course available using Skype, however as I outlined in chapter three, I conducted the first few interviews in the pilot study with the video function on, but participants did not turn theirs on. They did not comment on it and nor did I. After that I placed calls using the audio function only, and nobody queried this or asked about using video at any point, so I continued this practice. I can only speculate about why people did not question, initiate or in some cases even reciprocate the use of video in the interviews. Maybe internet connections were known to be too slow to support video conferencing or perhaps participants wished to make use of the extra level of anonymity in not using the video function, or perhaps because most people were being interviewed at home, and sometimes at odd hours because of time differences, they took the opportunity to wear their pyjamas! This study adds weight to earlier claims about the use of Skype for research interviews that “the benefits definitely outweigh the drawbacks” (Sullivan, 2012 p 59).

CONTRIBUTIONS TO AID AND DEVELOPMENT PRACTICE

Some of the findings from this study are applicable to aid agencies who employ international aid workers, and indeed, to those workers themselves. The study suggests that conceptualising achieving belonging in a local community, as is frequently expected of aid workers, is not a straightforward matter. In this study participants formulated belonging as a futile pursuit, that would ultimately fail because of immutable differences between aid workers and the local community. No claims to belonging were made by participants. Yet many aid agencies rely on aid workers' acceptance in a community as their main security strategy; which seems problematic given, in aid workers' accounts, it cannot be done. There is, then, a disconnect between aid organisations' treatment of belonging and that of aid workers. The security triangle approach to security (Van Brabant, 1998; Van Brabant, 2001) might then require reworking in order to accommodate aid workers' practices of belonging, in which the possibilities of fitting in or being accepted are far more limited than is recognised in the theoretical literature. The third facet of the security triangle appears to have been proposed without empirical evidence on which to base claims of its efficacy. Future research into the efficacy of such an approach which relies on the sympathies of the host population, should be conducted. Indeed, without this data, and in light of the findings in this study, the sense in relying on the security triangle approach is questionable.

POTENTIAL LIMITATIONS

Situating the Study in Psychological Literature

As has been discussed earlier in this chapter, and in the literature review and methodology chapters, this study could have been situated in a different set of literature(s). I made the decision to limit the scope to psychological literature, for reasons also outlined earlier, including both pragmatics and the fact that my main interest was in belonging as it might apply to psychology. Like many decisions in

research, this gave rise to some advantages and some drawbacks, also discussed earlier in the thesis. There is a body of literature on cross-border identities and community belonging that I might have drawn on but didn't, and this arguably constrained an exploration of wider issues related to the study of belongingness, such as political aspects of belonging.

Methodological Concerns and the use of Interviews

In chapter three, I outlined the argument supporting what is sometimes characterised as an increasing dis-preference among discursive psychologists for the use of interviews in the collection of interactional data (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998; Speer, 2002). Interview data is seen to be biased by the researcher's agenda and analytic ideas (Potter, 2004; Ten Have, 1999, 2002), which can lead participants to produce normatively appropriate descriptions (Potter, 2002). However, citing Schegloff (1991; 1992) and Widdicombe and Wooffitt (1995), I mount a case against this interpretation of interview data as 'unnatural', positing that this argument relies on participants demonstrably orienting to the context as that of an interview. That is, using Schegloff's argument for procedural consequentiality, interview data should be treated as ordinary conversation, unless it is observable that and how respondents attend to the situation in the specific extracts analysed as 'being in an interview' (Widdicombe & Wooffitt, 1995). On some occasions, in this study participants clearly orient to the interaction as a research interview, for example when asking what the study is about and the interviewer responds with a summary of the topic. In these moments, participant and interpreter, attend to the context as research, with a predetermined, uni-directional (i.e. the interviewer sets the agenda, the respondent follows the agenda) format. However, these orientations to the context as that of an interview are remarkably rare.

Another way in which the interview situation might be procedurally consequential, is if participants orient to my identity as an interviewer, rather than other possible identities. There were several instances in which participants oriented to me as a

former aid worker for example, referring to shared knowledge that might only be understood by other aid workers, or at least those working in the aid industry. For example, acronyms for INGOs, technical terms for equipment and experiences unique to aid workers formulated as shared knowledge using devices such as 'you know' or 'as you know'. Some respondents also demonstrably oriented to me as a woman and as a student. I therefore argue that the interviews conducted for this thesis should not be treated as specifically interview interaction unless otherwise demonstrated by participants (Wooffitt & Widdicombe, 2006). These interactions exhibit culturally shared accounting and reasoning practices which are at least potentially transferrable (Braun & Clarke, 2013) to other contexts beyond that of the research interview. The issue of generalisability is discussed in more detail below.

Generalisability

Generalisability has not traditionally been a concern among those conducting discursive analytic research. In part because smaller sample sizes and non-random sampling, typical of such work, limit the degree to which the results of a study can be considered to be representative of a population (Bryman, 2004). However, as Potter and Wetherell (1987, p.174) argue, generalisability is relevant if one is interested in "the practical use of [one's] work over and above the amassing of research findings and the furtherance of careers". Furthermore, as language is a shared cultural phenomenon the identification of particular discursive constructions suggest that these constructions are available to others and therefore generalisable (Bryman, 2004; Willig, 2001; Yin, 2003). It may be possible to generalise such 'theoretical' insights regarding the functions of constructions to similar interactional contexts. Braun and Clarke (2013) usefully refer to transferability, to reference the ways in which findings from discursive research might be applied to similar contexts. IN the case of this study 'similar contexts' might mean situations which are likely to raise similar interactional and interpersonal issues. For example, in chapter six, I have shown how participants referred to belonging as a continuum rather than a binary state. It seems likely therefore, that this construction of belonging is

available to others (rather than just those interviewed for this study) and in contexts broader than just research interviews. Furthermore, several theorists have argued that discourse analysis is concerned with the way in which interactional partners use culturally shared understandings and methods of making sense. These are therefore in principle available in the wider culture or society, making insights gained potentially generalisable to other cultural members (Taylor, 2001; Widdicombe, 1993; Willig, 2001). Taylor (2001, p. 25) specifies that in this case 'culture' should be taken as loosely defined, and does not necessarily mean a distinctive national tradition or 'neatly bounded' grouping. However, this of course raises questions as to which cultural groupings particular findings might be generalised, which is potentially highly problematic given what we know about the construction of identities, including group identities (Widdicombe, 1993). Thus, while the findings of the study described in this thesis may be generalisable, as the researcher I could not confidently predict what these contexts or populations might be. However, this is not an issue unique to this study, or even to qualitative research. The generalisability of a study can arguably never be fully determined in advance, researchers must always speculate to some extent, whether and to what degree a study's findings might be extrapolated to other populations and contexts (Seale, 1999; Taylor, 2001; Wetherell et al., 1998). Perhaps the primary utility of this research, then, is how findings might influence more sensitive advice, or on how further work on belonging could be conducted.

Reflexivity

Discourse analysts' claims that language is constructive, necessarily implies that the researcher and author of a study, actively contributes to the construction of the research 'findings', rather than acting as a mere witness or conduit through which truths and facts are uncovered. Like any academic text, this thesis then, could be examined for the rhetorical techniques used in order to produce the analysis and make it convincing (Potter & Wetherell, 1987). Hammersley (2003) points out that few discourse analysts actually engage in such a de-construction of their own

writings, arguing that discourse analysts are inconsistent in their epistemological treatments, engaging in 'ontological gerrymandering'. However, there are those who argue against a detailed reflexive analysis of one's own work, for pragmatic reasons (Potter & Wetherell, 1987; Wetherell, 2001). As Nicolson and McLaughlin (1995, p.116) explain, the aim of social constructionist studies is normally to provide insight into the constructed nature of others' claims rather than one's own, and 'it seems good practice to do either one or the other, and not both simultaneously'. Similarly, Potter and Wetherell (1987, p.183) point out that 'the most practical way of dealing with this issue is simply to get on with it, and not to get either paralysed by, or caught up in, the infinite regresses possible'. For this reason, although I sympathise with the epistemological basis of Hammersley's (2003) claims, I do not engage in a rhetorical analysis of my work in this thesis.

At this moment, though, it seems appropriate to outline my position with regard to the empirical claims contained in this thesis. The analysis presented here is just one of many possible 'readings' of the data which could have been produced (Willig, 2001). While I am not claiming that *any* other interpretation could have been put forward, I could have chosen to focus on other aspects of the data, which may have led to a selection of different extracts and therefore an alternative focus and necessarily different findings. Therefore, I have not produced a fact upon the world, nor uncovered *the* truth about belonging, but rather provided one particular examination of belonging, and its management in interaction.

CONCLUSIONS

The study on which this thesis is based, represents the first discursive psychological study of belonging among aid workers. In addition, this study is among the first in which internet-based calling software was used to conduct interviews with participants. The results indicate that, in practice, belonging may be treated as more nuanced than psychologists currently understand it to be. And unlike the way aid

agencies seem to treat the practice, belonging is not necessarily straightforward, it requires conscious effort. Indeed, whether a sense of belonging is even achievable for aid workers is a matter treated as negotiable in aid workers' accounts. These findings have implications for the study of belonging, for security policy in aid organisations and for the daily lives of aid workers themselves. However, given this is the first discursive psychological study of aid workers, the findings would be strengthened by further research. Future research into the ways belonging is negotiated, achieved and resisted in interaction would provide a better understanding of belonging as a discursive practice, and further studies of the range of ways of belonging – for example not being noticed, fitting in and being accepted – would help to build on these findings.

References

- Adler, A. (1930). *The education of children*. London: Allen and Unwin.
- Anant, S. S. (1967). Belongingness and mental health: Some research findings. *Acta Psychologica*, 26, 391–396. doi:10.1016/0001-6918(67)90035-2
- Anant, S. S. (1969a). A cross-cultural study of belongingness, anxiety and self sufficiency. *Acta Psychologica*, 31, 385–393. doi:10.1016/0001-6918(69)90095-x
- Anant, S. S. (1969b). A cross-cultural study of belongingness, anxiety and self sufficiency. *Acta Psychologica*, 31, 385–393. doi:10.1016/0001-6918(69)90095-x
- Antaki, C., & Widdicombe, S. (Eds.). (1998). *Identities in talk*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Atkinson, M. J., & Heritage, J. (Eds.). (1985). *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis - international conference on practical reasoning and discourse processes, papers*. New York: Editions de la Maison des sciences de l'homme.
- Baker, C. (2004). Membership categorization and interview accounts. In D. Silverman (Ed.), *Qualitative research: Theory, method and practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Bandler, R., Öngür, D., & Price, J. L. (1998). Prefrontal cortical projections to longitudinal columns in the midbrain periaqueductal gray in macaque monkeys. *The Journal of Comparative Neurology*, 401(4), 455–479. doi:10.1002/(sici)1096-9861(19981130)401:4<455::aid-cne3>3.0.co;2-6
- Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (1995). The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 117(3), 497–529. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.117.3.497
- Baumeister, R. F., Twenge, J. M., & Nuss, C. K. (2002). Effects of social exclusion on cognitive processes: Anticipated aloneness reduces intelligent thought. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83(4), 817–827. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.83.4.817
- BBC (2013, December 3). Sri Lanka's forces accused of massacring aid workers. *BBC Asia*. Retrieved from <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-asia-25198856>

- Billig, M. (1999). Whose terms? Whose Ordinariness? Rhetoric and ideology in conversation analysis. *Discourse & Society*, 10(4), 543–558.
doi:10.1177/0957926599010004005
- Billig, M., Condor, S., Edwards, D., Gane, M. J., & Radley, A. (1988). *Ideological dilemmas: A social psychology of everyday thinking*. London: Sage Publications.
- Blackhart, G. C., Eckel, L. A., & Tice, D. M. (2007). Salivary cortisol in response to acute social rejection and acceptance by peers. *Biological Psychology*, 75(3), 267–276. doi:10.1016/j.biopsycho.2007.03.005
- Bolden, G. B. (2006). Little words that matter: Discourse markers “so” and “oh” and the doing of Other-Attentiveness in social interaction. *Journal of Communication*, 56(4), 661–688. doi:10.1111/j.1460-2466.2006.00314.x
- Boomsma, D. I., Willemsen, G., Dolan, C. V., Hawkley, L. C., & Cacioppo, J. T. (2005). Genetic and environmental contributions to loneliness in adults: The Netherlands twin register study. *Behavior Genetics*, 35(6), 745–752.
doi:10.1007/s10519-005-6040-8
- Brenneis, D. (1986). : Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis . Maxwell Atkinson, John Heritage. *American Anthropologist*, 88(4), 1025–1026.
doi:10.1525/aa.1986.88.4.02a00820
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2013). *Successful qualitative research: A practical guide for beginners*. Sage. Chicago
- Brown, B., McGregor, M., & Laurier, E. (2013, April). *iPhone in vivo: video analysis of mobile device use*.
- Bruzzi, S. (1997). *Undressing cinema: Clothing and identity in the movies*. New York: Routledge.
- Bryman, A. (2001). *Social research methods*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, USA.
- Butler, J. P. (1990). *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity*. New York: Routledge.
- Chakrabarty, D. (2000). *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial thought and historical difference*. United States: Princeton University Press.

- Chen, Z., Williams, K. D., Fitness, J., & Newton, N. C. (2008). When hurt will not heal: Exploring the capacity to relive social and physical pain. *Psychological Science*, 19(8), 789–795. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9280.2008.02158.x
- Childs, A. (2013). Cultural theory and acceptance based security strategies for humanitarian aid workers. *Journal of Strategic Security*, 6(1), 64–72. doi:10.5038/1944-0472.6.1.6
- Chow, R. M., Tiedens, L. Z., & Govan, C. L. (2008). Excluded emotions: The role of anger in antisocial responses to ostracism. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 44(3), 896–903. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2007.09.004
- Clift, R. (2006). Indexing stance: Reported speech as an interactional evidential. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 10(5), 569–595. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9841.2006.00296.x
- Cohen, A. P. (Ed.). (1982). *Belonging: Identity and social Organisation in British rural cultures*. United Kingdom: Manchester University Press.
- Collinson, S., Elhawary, S., & Muggah, R. (2010). States of fragility: Stabilisation and its implications for humanitarian action. *Disasters*, 34, S275–S296. doi:10.1111/j.1467-7717.2010.01206.x
- Craig, A. D., & Dostrovsky, J. O. (1989). Medulla to thalamus. In P. D. Wall & R. Melzack (Eds.), *Textbook of pain* (pp. 183–214). United Kingdom: Churchill Livingstone.
- Crane, D. (2000). *Fashion and its social agendas: Class, gender, and identity in clothing*. Chicago: University Of Chicago Press.
- Dandeneau, S. D., Baldwin, M. W., Baccus, J. R., Sakellaropoulo, M., & Pruessner, J. C. (2007). Cutting stress off at the pass: Reducing vigilance and responsiveness to social threat by manipulating attention. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 93(4), 651–666. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.93.4.651
- Dasberg, H. (1976). Belonging and loneliness in relation to mental breakdown in battle. *Israeli Annals of Psychiatry*, 14(4), 307–321.
- Davis, F. (1992). *Fashion, culture, and identity*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- de Kok, B. (1996). *Constructing infertility in Malawi: Management of interpersonal, normative and moral issues in talk*

- de Kok, B. C., & Widdicombe, S. (2008). "I really tried": Management of normative issues in accounts of responses to infertility. *Social Science & Medicine*, 67(7), 1083–1093. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2008.05.007
- Deakin, H., & Wakefield, K. (2013). Skype interviewing: Reflections of two PhD researchers. *Qualitative Research*, 14(5), 603–616. doi:10.1177/1468794113488126
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.). (2011). *The sage handbook of qualitative research (Third edition)* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- DeWall, C. N., & Baumeister, R. F. (2006). Alone but feeling no pain: Effects of social exclusion on physical pain tolerance and pain threshold, affective forecasting, and interpersonal empathy. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 91(1), 1–15. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.91.1.1
- DeWall, C. N., Baumeister, R. F., & Vohs, K. D. (2008). Satiated with belongingness? Effects of acceptance, rejection, and task framing on self-regulatory performance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 95(6), 1367–1382. doi:10.1037/a0012632
- Dickerson, S. S., & Kemeny, M. E. (2004). Acute stressors and Cortisol responses: A theoretical integration and synthesis of laboratory research. *Psychological Bulletin*, 130(3), 355–391. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.130.3.355
- Dickerson, S. S., Mycek, P. J., & Zaldivar, F. (2008). Negative social evaluation, but not mere social presence, elicits cortisol responses to a laboratory stressor task. *Health Psychology*, 27(1), 116–121. doi:10.1037/0278-6133.27.1.116
- Drew, P. (1990). Strategies in the contest between lawyer and witness in cross-examination. In J. N. Levi & A. G. Walker (Eds.), *Language in the judicial process* (pp. 39–64). United States: Plenum Publishing Co., N.Y.
- Drew, P., & Holt, E. (1988). Complainable matters: The use of idiomatic expressions in making complaints. *Social Problems*, 35(4), 398–417. doi:10.1525/sp.1988.35.4.03a00060
- Edwards, D. (1994). Script formulations: An analysis of event descriptions in conversation. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 13(3), 211–247. doi:10.1177/0261927x94133001
- Edwards, D. (1996). *Discourse and cognition*. London: SAGE Publications.

- Edwards, D., Ashmore, M., & Potter, J. (1995). Death and furniture: The rhetoric, politics and theology of bottom line arguments against relativism. *History of the Human Sciences*, 8(2), 25–49. doi:10.1177/095269519500800202
- Edwards, D., & Potter, J. (1993). Language and causation: A discursive action model of description and attribution. *Psychological Review*, 100(1), 23–41. doi:10.1037/0033-295x.100.1.23
- Edwards, D., & Potter, J. (2013). *Discursive psychology*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Egelund, J., Harmer, A., & Stoddard, A. (2011). To stay and deliver: Good practice for humanitarians in complex security environments. Retrieved 25 July 2016, from <http://www.unocha.org/about-us/publications/stay-and-deliver-good-practice-humanitarians-complex-security-environments>
- Eisenberger, N. I. (2003). Does rejection hurt? An fMRI study of social exclusion. *Science*, 302(5643), 290–292. doi:10.1126/science.1089134
- Eisenberger, N. I., Gable, S. L., & Lieberman, M. D. (2007). Functional magnetic resonance imaging responses relate to differences in real-world social experience. *Emotion*, 7(4), 745–754. doi:10.1037/1528-3542.7.4.745
- Eisenberger, N. I., Jarcho, J. M., Lieberman, M. D., & Naliboff, B. D. (2006). An experimental study of shared sensitivity to physical pain and social rejection. *Pain*, 126(1), 132–138. doi:10.1016/j.pain.2006.06.024
- Eisenberger, N. I., & Lieberman, M. D. (2004). Why rejection hurts: A common neural alarm system for physical and social pain. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 8(7), 294–300. doi:10.1016/j.tics.2004.05.010
- Eisenberger, N. I., Way, B. M., Taylor, S. E., Welch, W. T., & Lieberman, M. D. (2007). Understanding genetic risk for aggression: Clues from the brain's response to social exclusion. *Biological Psychiatry*, 61(9), 1100–1108. doi:10.1016/j.biopsych.2006.08.007
- Ellenberger, H. F. (1970). *The discovery of the unconscious: The history and evolution of dynamic psychiatry*. London: New York, N.Y.

- Elliot, A. J. (2006). Approach and avoidance motivation in the social domain. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 32(3), 378–391.
doi:10.1177/0146167205282153
- Epley, N., Akalis, S., Waytz, A., & Cacioppo, J. T. (2008). Creating social connection through inferential reproduction: Loneliness and perceived agency in gadgets, gods, and Greyhounds. *Psychological Science*, 19(2), 114–120. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9280.2008.02056.x
- Fail, H. (2004). Belonging, identity and Third culture kids: Life histories of former international school students. *Journal of Research in International Education*, 3(3), 319–338. doi:10.1177/1475240904047358
- Fast, L. (2015). How can we keep aid workers safe? Retrieved 25 July 2016, from <https://politicalviolenceataglance.org/2015/08/19/how-can-we-keep-aid-workers-safe/>
- Favell, A. (1999). The politics of belonging: Migrants and minorities in contemporary Europe. In J. A. Geddes & A. Favell (Eds.), *Migrants and Minorities in Contemporary Europe* (pp. 209–227). United Kingdom: Ashgate Publishing.
- Ferguson, E. D. (1989). Adler's motivational theory: An historical perspective on belonging and the fundamental human striving. *Individual Psychology: The Journal of Adlerian Theory, Research & Practice*, 45, 354–361.
- Freud, S., Brill, A. A., B, P. H., & Putnam, J. J. (2007). *Collected works of Sigmund Freud: Three contributions to the theory of sex, and dream psychology*. Charleston, SC: BiblioBazaar.
- Gaertner, L., Iuzzini, J., & O'Mara, E. M. (2008). When rejection by one fosters aggression against many: Multiple-victim aggression as a consequence of social rejection and perceived groupness. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 44(4), 958–970. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2008.02.004
- Gardner, W. L. (2005). On the outside looking in: Loneliness and social monitoring. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 31(11), 1549–1560.
doi:10.1177/0146167205277208

- Gavey, N. (2004). *Just sex? The cultural scaffolding of rape*. New York: Psychology Press.
- Goodman, S., & Burke, S. (2010). 'Oh you don't want asylum seekers, oh you're just racist': A discursive analysis of discussions about whether it's racist to oppose asylum seeking. *Discourse & Society*, 21(3), 325–340.
doi:10.1177/0957926509360743
- Gorman, R. F. (2001). *Great debates at the United Nations: An encyclopedia of Fifty key issues, 1945-2000*. United States: Greenwood Publishing Group.
- Greene, J. O., & Burleson, B. R. (2003). Conversation analysis and institutional talk. In *Handbook of communication and social interaction skills* (pp. 103–147). United States: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Gruenewald, T. L., Kemeny, M. E., Aziz, N., & Fahey, J. L. (2004). Acute threat to the social self: Shame, social self-esteem, and Cortisol activity. *Psychosomatic Medicine*, 66(6), 915–924. doi:10.1097/01.psy.0000143639.61693.ef
- Gyurak, A., & Ayduk, Ö. (2008). Resting respiratory sinus arrhythmia buffers against rejection sensitivity via emotion control. *Emotion*, 8(4), 458–467.
doi:10.1037/1528-3542.8.4.458
- Hagerty, B. M. K., Lynch-Sauer, J., Patusky, K. L., Bouwsema, M., & Collier, P. (1992). Sense of belonging: A vital mental health concept. *Archives of Psychiatric Nursing*, 6(3), 172–177. doi:10.1016/0883-9417(92)90028-h
- Hale, W. W., VanderValk, I., Akse, J., & Meeus, W. (2008). The interplay of early adolescents' Depressive symptoms, aggression and perceived parental rejection: A Four-Year community study. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 37(8), 928–940.
doi:10.1007/s10964-008-9280-0
- Hames, J. L., Chiurliza, B., Podlogar, M. C., Smith, A. R., Selby, E. A., Anestis, M. D., & Joiner, T. E. (2015). Perceived Burdensomeness and thwarted Belongingness predict excessive reassurance seeking among clinical Outpatients. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 71(6), 597–605. doi:10.1002/jclp.22158

- Hamilton, R. J. (2014). Using Skype to conduct interviews for psychosocial research. *CIN: Computers, Informatics, Nursing*, 32(8), 353–358.
doi:10.1097/cin.0000000000000095
- Hammersley, M. (1990). *The dilemma of qualitative method: Herbert Blumer and the Chicago tradition*. New York: Routledge.
- Hammersley, M. (2003). Conversation analysis and discourse analysis: Methods or paradigms? *Discourse & Society*, 14(6), 751–781. doi:10.1177/09579265030146004
- Hanna, P. (2012). Using internet technologies (such as Skype) as a research medium: A research note. *Qualitative Research*, 12(2), 239–242.
doi:10.1177/1468794111426607
- Harmer, A. (2008). Integrated missions: A threat to humanitarian security? *International Peacekeeping*, 15(4), 528–539. doi:10.1080/13533310802239824
- Harrison, N. (2003). *Postcolonial criticism: History, theory and the work of fiction*. United Kingdom: Polity Press.
- Hawkey, L. C., Burleson, M. H., Berntson, G. G., & Cacioppo, J. T. (2003). Loneliness in everyday life: Cardiovascular activity, psychosocial context, and health behaviors. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 85(1), 105–120.
doi:10.1037/0022-3514.85.1.105
- Haysom, S., & Jackson, A. (2013). “You don’t need to love us”: Civil-military relations in Afghanistan, 2002–13. *Stability: International Journal of Security and Development*, 2(2), 38. doi:10.5334/sta.by
- Heritage, J. (1984). *Garfinkel and ethnomethodology*. New York, NY: Polity Press.
- Heritage, J., & Raymond, G. (2005). The terms of agreement: Indexing Epistemic authority and Subordination in talk-in-interaction. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 68(1), 15–38. doi:10.1177/019027250506800103
- Housley, W., & Fitzgerald, R. (2002). The reconsidered model of membership categorization analysis. *Qualitative Research*, 2(1), 59–83.
doi:10.1177/146879410200200104
- Hutchby, I., & Wooffitt, R. (2008). *Conversation analysis* (2nd ed.). Malden, MA: Polity Press.

- Irish Aid Guidelines for NGO Professional Safety & Security Risk Management.
(n.d.). Retrieved 25 July 2016, from
<http://www.dci.gov.ie/media/irishaid/allwebsitemedia/20newsandpublications/irish-aid-guidelines-for-ngo-professional-safety-and-security-risk-management.pdf>
- Janghorban, R., Roudsari, R. L., & Taghipour, A. (2014). Skype interviewing: The new generation of online synchronous interview in qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies on Health and Well-Being*, 9, .
doi:10.3402/qhw.v9.24152
- Jefferson, G. (1974). Error correction as an interactional resource. *Language in Society*, 3(02), 181. doi:10.1017/s0047404500004334
- Jefferson, G. (2004). Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In G. H. Lerner (Ed.), *Conversation analysis: Studies from the First generation* (p. 1331). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- Kestenbergs, M., & Kestenbergs, J. S. (1988). The sense of belonging and altruism in children who survived the Holocaust. *Psychoanalytic Review*, 75(4), 533–560.
- Kiely, R., Bechhofer, F., & McCrone, D. (2005). Birth, blood and belonging: Identity claims in post-devolution Scotland1. *The Sociological Review*, 53(1), 150–171.
doi:10.1111/j.1467-954x.2005.00507.x
- Knoblauch, H., Baer, A., Laurier, E., Petschke, S., & Schnettler, B. (2008). Visual analysis. New developments in the interpretative analysis of video and photography. *Qualitative Social Research*, 9(3),
- Knowles, M. L., & Gardner, W. L. (2008). Benefits of membership: The activation and amplification of group identities in response to social rejection. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 34(9), 1200–1213. doi:10.1177/0146167208320062
- Kross, E., Egner, T., Ochsner, K., Hirsch, J., & Downey, G. (2007). Neural dynamics of rejection sensitivity. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 19(6), 945–956.
doi:10.1162/jocn.2007.19.6.945
- Krämer, N., Hoffmann, L., & Eimler, S. (2015). Not breaking bonds on Facebook—Mixed-Methods research on the influence of individuals' need to belong on

- "Unfriending" behavior on Facebook. *International Journal of Developmental Science*, 9(2), 61–74. doi:10.3233/dev-150161
- Kvale, S., & Brinkmann, S. (2004). *Inter views: Learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Lambertz, K. (2001). Back-channelling: the use of yeah and mm to portray engaged listenership. *Griffith Working Papers in Pragmatics and Intercultural Communication*, 4(1/2), 11–18.
- Lampropoulou, S., & Myers, G. (2013). Stance taking in interviews from the qualidata archive. *Qualitative Social Research*, 14(1),
- Laurier, E. (2009). Being there/seeing there: Recording and analysing life in the car. In B. Fincham, M. McGuinness, & L. Murray (Eds.), *Mobile methodologies* (pp. 103–117). United Kingdom: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Leary, M. R. (2005). Varieties of interpersonal rejection. In K. D. Williams, W. von Hippel, & J. P. Forgas (Eds.), *The social outcast: Ostracism, social exclusion, rejection, and bullying*. United Kingdom: Psychology Press.
- Leary, M. R., Twenge, J. M., & Quinlivan, E. (2006). Interpersonal rejection as a determinant of anger and aggression. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 10(2), 111–132. doi:10.1207/s15327957pspr1002_2
- Lemay, E. P., & Clark, M. S. (2008). "Walking on eggshells": How expressing relationship insecurities perpetuates them. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 95(2), 420–441. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.95.2.420
- Lewin, K. (1939). Field theory and experiment in social psychology: Concepts and methods. *American Journal of Sociology*, 44(6), 868. doi:10.1086/218177
- Lindgren, C. L., Pass, C. M., & Sime, A. M. (1990). Burnout and social support in family caregivers. *Western Journal of Nursing Research*, 12(4), 469–487. doi:10.1177/019394599001200404
- London, B., Downey, G., Bonica, C., & Paltin, I. (2007). Social causes and consequences of rejection sensitivity. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 17(3), 481–506. doi:10.1111/j.1532-7795.2007.00531.x

- MacDonald, G. (2008). Use of pain threshold reports to satisfy social needs. *Pain Research and Management*, 13(4), 309–319. doi:10.1155/2008/289575
- MacDonald, G., & Leary, M. R. (2005). Why does social exclusion hurt? The relationship between social and physical pain. *Psychological Bulletin*, 131(2), 202–223. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.131.2.202
- MacPherson, R., & Pafford, B. (2012). *CARE International Safety and Security Handbook*. Retrieved July 25, 2016, from <http://fromhttp://www.coe-dmha.org/care/pdf/EntireBook.pdf>
- Madill, A., Widdicombe, S., & Barkham, M. (2001). The potential of conversation analysis for psychotherapy research. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 29(3), 413–434. doi:10.1177/0011000001293006
- Maestripieri, D., Higley, J. D., Lindell, S. G., Newman, T. K., McCormack, K. M., & Sanchez, M. M. (2006). Early maternal rejection affects the development of monoaminergic systems and adult abusive parenting in rhesus macaques (*Macaca mulatta*). *Behavioral Neuroscience*, 120(5), 1017–1024. doi:10.1037/0735-7044.120.5.1017
- Maner, J. K., DeWall, C. N., Baumeister, R. F., & Schaller, M. (2007). Does social exclusion motivate interpersonal reconnection? Resolving the “porcupine problem.” *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 92(1), 42–55. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.92.1.42
- Maslow, A. H. (1943). *A theory of human motivation*. United States: Martino Fine Books.
- Mazeland, H., & ten Have, P. (1996). Essential tensions in (semi-) open research interviews. In I. Maso & F. Wester (Eds.), *The deliberate dialogue* (pp. 87–113). Brussels, Belgium: VUBPress.
- McEwan, C. (2001). Postcolonialism, feminism and development: Intersections and dilemmas. *Progress in Development Studies*, 1(2), 93–111. doi:10.1177/146499340100100201
- McKinlay, A., & McVittie, C. (2009). *Social psychology and discourse*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell Pub.

- MEERLOO, J. A. M. (1966). Why do we sympathize with each other? *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 15(4), 390. doi:10.1001/archpsyc.1966.01730160054009
- Mendes, W. B., Major, B., McCoy, S., & Blascovich, J. (2008). How attributional ambiguity shapes physiological and emotional responses to social rejection and acceptance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 94(2), 278–291. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.94.2.278
- Mikulincer, M., & Shaver, P. R. (2007). *Attachment in adulthood: Structure, dynamics, and change*. New York: Guilford Publications.
- Mishler, E. G. G., Wallat, C., & Green, J. (1985). *The discourse of medicine: Dialectics of medical interviews*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Pub. Corp.
- Molden, D. C., Lucas, G. M., Gardner, W. L., Dean, K., & Knowles, M. L. (2009). Motivations for prevention or promotion following social exclusion: Being rejected versus being ignored. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 96(2), 415–431. doi:10.1037/a0012958
- Monzoni, C. M. (2008). Introducing direct complaints through questions: The interactional achievement of “pre-sequences”? *Discourse Studies*, 10(1), 73–87. doi:10.1177/1461445607085591
- Murray, S. L., Derrick, J. L., Leder, S., & Holmes, J. G. (2008). Balancing connectedness and self-protection goals in close relationships: A levels-of-processing perspective on risk regulation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 94(3), 429–459. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.94.3.429
- Myers, G., & Lampropoulou, S. (2012). Impersonal you and stance-taking in social research interviews. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 44(10), 1206–1218. doi:10.1016/j.pragma.2012.05.005
- Myers, G., & Lampropoulou, S. (2013). What place references can do in social research interviews. *Discourse Studies*, 15(3), 333–351. doi:10.1177/1461445613480589
- Newsom, J. T., Mahan, T. L., Rook, K. S., & Krause, N. (2008). “Stable negative social exchanges and health”: Correction to Newsom et al. (2008). *Health Psychology*, 27(3), 357–357. doi:10.1037/0278-6133.27.3.357

- Nicolson, M., & McLaughlin, C. (2008). Social constructionism and medical sociology: A reply to M. R. Bury. *Sociology of Health & Illness*, 9(2), 107–126. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9566.1987.tb00307.x
- Nitti, D. (2013). *Strengthening of the coordination of humanitarian and disaster relief assistance of the United Nations, including special economic assistance safety and security of humanitarian personnel and protection of Uni*. Retrieved from <http://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/N1348884.pdf>
- Oaten, M., Williams, K. D., Jones, A., & Zadro, L. (2008). The effects of ostracism on Self-Regulation in the socially anxious. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 27(5), 471–504. doi:10.1521/jscp.2008.27.5.471
- Onwuegbuzie, A. J., Leech, N. L., & Collins, A. M. (2010). Innovative data collection strategies in qualitative research. *The Qualitative Report*, 15(3), 696.
- Panksepp, J. (1998). *Affective neuroscience: The foundations of human and animal emotions*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Petrovic, P. (2002). Placebo and Opioid Analgesia-- imaging a shared neuronal network. *Science*, 295(5560), 1737–1740. doi:10.1126/science.1067176
- Pickett, C. L. (2004). Getting a cue: The need to belong and enhanced sensitivity to social cues. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 30(9), 1095–1107. doi:10.1177/0146167203262085
- Potter, J. (1996). *Representing reality: Discourse, rhetoric and social construction*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Potter, J. (2002). Two kinds of natural. *Discourse Studies*, 4(4), 539–542. doi:10.1177/14614456020040040901
- Potter, J. (2004). Discourse Analysis. In M. A. Hardy & A. Bryman (Eds.), *Handbook of data analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Potter, J., & Hepburn, A. (1997). Conversation analysis: An approach to the study of social action as sense making practices. In T. A. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse studies: A Multidisciplinary introduction: V. 2: Discourse as social interactions*. London: SAGE Publications.

- Potter, J., & Hepburn, A. (2005). Qualitative interviews in psychology: Problems and possibilities. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 2(4), 281–307.
doi:10.1191/1478088705qp045oa
- Potter, J., Wetherell, M., & Potter, O. (1987). *Discourse and social psychology: Beyond attitudes and behaviour*. London: Sage Publications.
- Radburn, B., & Horsley, R. (2011). Gamblers, grinders, and mavericks: The use of membership categorisation to manage identity by professional poker players. *Journal of Gambling Issues*, 26, 30–50. doi:10.4309/jgi.2011.26.4
- Rainville, P., Carrier, B., Hofbauer, R. K., Bushnell, C. M., & Duncan, G. H. (1999). Dissociation of sensory and affective dimensions of pain using hypnotic modulation. *Pain*, 82(2), 159–171. doi:10.1016/s0304-3959(99)00048-2
- REICHER, S., & HOPKINS, N. (1996). Self-category constructions in political rhetoric; an analysis of Thatcher's and Kinnock's speeches concerning the British miners' strike (1984–5). *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 26(3), 353–371.
doi:10.1002/(sici)1099-0992(199605)26:3<353::aid-ejsp757>3.0.co;2-o
- Reicher, S., & Hopkins, N. (1996). Seeking influence through characterizing self-categories: An analysis of anti-abortionist rhetoric. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 35(2), 297–311. doi:10.1111/j.2044-8309.1996.tb01099.x
- Reicher, S. D., & Hopkins, N. (2001). *Self and nation: Categorization, Contestation, and mobilization*. London: Thousand Oaks, Calif.
- Reijntjes, A., Stegge, H., Terwogt, M. M., Kamphuis, J. H., & Telch, M. J. (2006). Emotion regulation and its effects on mood improvement in response to an in vivo peer rejection challenge. *Emotion*, 6(4), 543–552. doi:10.1037/1528-3542.6.4.543
- Rios, K., Fast, N. J., & Gruenfeld, D. H. (2015). Feeling high but playing low: Power, need to belong, and submissive behavior. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 41(8), 1135–1146. doi:10.1177/0146167215591494
- Roberts, D. L. (2006). *Staying Alive: Safety and Security Guidelines for humanitarian volunteers in conflict areas*. Retrieved from
https://www.icrc.org/eng/assets/files/other/icrc_002_0717.pdf

- Roschelle, J., & Teasley, S. D. (1995). The construction of shared knowledge in collaborative problem solving. In *Computer Supported collaborative Learning* (pp. 59–67). Berlin: Springer.
- Sacks, H. (2010). *Lectures on conversation: V. 1 & 2*. Cambridge, MA: Wiley-Blackwell (an imprint of John Wiley & Sons Ltd).
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*, 50(4), 696–735.
doi:10.1353/lan.1974.0010
- Schegloff, E. A. (1982). Discourse as an interactional achievement: Some uses of “uh huh” and other things that come between sentence. In D. Tannen (Ed.), *Analyzing Discourse: Text and Talk. Georgetown university round table on languages and linguistics (GURT) 1981: Analyzing discourse: Text and talk* (pp. 71–93). United States: Georgetown University Press.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1992). In Another Context. In A. Duranti & C. Goodwin (Eds.), *Rethinking context: Language as an interactive phenomenon* (p. 191). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1993). Reflections on talk and social structure. In D. H. Zimmerman & D. Boden (Eds.), *Talk and social structure: Studies in ethnomethodology and conversation analysis*. Oxford: Polity Press.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1997). Whose text? Whose context? *Discourse & Society*, 8(2), 165–187. doi:10.1177/0957926597008002002
- Schegloff, E. A. (1998). Reply to Wetherell. *Discourse & Society*, 9(3), 413–416.
doi:10.1177/0957926598009003006
- SCHEGLOFF, E. A. (1999). Schegloff’s texts’ as “Billig’s data”: A critical reply. *Discourse & Society*, 10(4), 558–572. doi:10.1177/0957926599010004006
- Schegloff, E. A. (2007). A tutorial on membership categorization. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 39(3), 462–482. doi:10.1016/j.pragma.2006.07.007
- seawl. (2011, January 21). #15 dressing like the locals Retrieved from <https://stuffexpataidworkerslike.com/2011/01/21/15-dressing-like-the-locals/>

- Smith, J. A. (2011). Evaluating the contribution of interpretative phenomenological analysis: A reply to the commentaries and further development of criteria. *Health Psychology Review*, 5(1), 55–61. doi:10.1080/17437199.2010.541743
- Smith, J. A., Hollway, W., & Mishler, E. G. (2005). Commentaries on potter and Hepburn, “qualitative interviews in psychology: Problems and possibilities.” *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 2(4), 309–325. doi:10.1191/1478088705qp046cm
- Somerville, L. H., Heatherton, T. F., & Kelley, W. M. (2006). Anterior cingulate cortex responds differentially to expectancy violation and social rejection. *Nature Neuroscience*, 9(8), 1007–1008. doi:10.1038/nn1728
- Speer, S. A. (2002). “Natural” and “contrived” data: A sustainable distinction? *Discourse Studies*, 4(4), 511–525. doi:10.1177/14614456020040040601
- Steinkamp, M. W., & Kelly, J. R. (1987). Social integration, leisure activity, and life satisfaction in older adults: Activity theory revisited. *The International Journal of Aging and Human Development*, 25(4), 293–307. doi:10.2190/v813-qa3g-6aqc-mwym
- Stivers, T., & Heritage, J. (2001). Breaking the sequential mold: Answering “more than the question” during comprehensive history taking. *Text – Interdisciplinary Journal for the Study of Discourse*, 21(1-2), . doi:10.1515/text.1.21.1-2.151
- Stoddard, A., & Harmer, A. (2010). *Supporting security for humanitarian action A review of critical issues for the humanitarian community*. Retrieved from [https://www.humanitarianoutcomes.org/sites/default/files/resources/Supporting SecurityforHumanitarianActionMarch20101.pdf](https://www.humanitarianoutcomes.org/sites/default/files/resources/Supporting%20SecurityforHumanitarianActionMarch20101.pdf)
- Stoddard, A., Humanitarian Policy Group, Harmer, A., & Didomenico, V. (2009). *Providing aid in insecure environments: Trends in violence against aid workers and the operational response (2009 update) - HPG policy briefs 34*. Retrieved from <https://www.odi.org/sites/odi.org.uk/files/odi-assets/publications-opinion-files/4243.pdf>
- STOKOE, E. H., & SMITHSON, J. (2001). Making gender relevant: Conversation analysis and gender categories in interaction. *Discourse & Society*, 12(2), 217–244. doi:10.1177/0957926501012002005

- Sullivan, J. R. (2012). Skype: An appropriate method of data collection for qualitative interviews? *The Hilltop Review*, 6(1),
- Taylor, S. (2001). Evaluating and applying discourse analytic research. In M. Wetherell, S. Taylor, & S. J. Yates (Eds.), *Discourse as data: A guide for analysis* (pp. 311–330). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publ. in assoc. with The Open Univ.
- ten Have, P. (1990). Methodological issues in conversation analysis1. *Bulletin de Méthodologie Sociologique*, 27(1), 23–51. doi:10.1177/075910639002700102
- ten Have, P. (2002). *The Notion of Member is the Heart of the Matter: On the Role of Membership Knowledge in Ethnomethodological Inquiry*.
- Thau, S., Aquino, K., & Poortvliet, P. M. (2007). Self-defeating behaviors in organizations: The relationship between thwarted belonging and interpersonal work behaviors. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(3), 840–847. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.92.3.840
- Top 5 packing tips for humanitarian aid workers. (2014, April 3). Retrieved July 25, 2016, from https://www.disasterready.org/blog/top-5-packing-tips-humanitarian-aid-workers#.V13kC_l96Uk
- Tops, M., Riese, H., Oldehinkel, A. J., Rijdsdijk, F. V., & Ormel, J. (2008). Rejection sensitivity relates to hypocortisolism and depressed mood state in young women. *Psychoneuroendocrinology*, 33(5), 551–559. doi:10.1016/j.psyneuen.2008.01.011
- Tuffin, K. (2004). *Understanding critical social psychology*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Twenge, J. M., Baumeister, R. F., Tice, D. M., & Stucke, T. S. (2001). If you can't join them, beat them: Effects of social exclusion on aggressive behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 81(6), 1058–1069. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.81.6.1058
- Twigg, J. (2014). Clothing, identity and the embodiment of age. In *Textile-led Design for the Active Ageing Population* (p. 13)

- Underwood, M. K., & Ehrenreich, S. E. (2014). Bullying may be fueled by the desperate need to belong. *Theory Into Practice*, 53(4), 265–270.
doi:10.1080/00405841.2014.947217
- UNOSOM I. . Retrieved from
<http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/missions/past/unosom2backgr2>
- van Beest, I., & Williams, K. D. (2006). When inclusion costs and ostracism pays, ostracism still hurts. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 91(5), 918–928.
doi:10.1037/0022-3514.91.5.918
- Van Brabant, K. (2011). *Mainstreaming the Organisational Management of Safety and Securit*. Retrieved from <https://www.odi.org/sites/odi.org.uk/files/odi-assets/publications-opinion-files/297.pdf>
- Walton, G. M., & Cohen, G. L. (2007). A question of belonging: Race, social fit, and achievement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 92(1), 82–96.
doi:10.1037/0022-3514.92.1.82
- Watson, D. R. (1978). Categorization, authorization and blame - negotiation in conversation. *Sociology*, 12(1), 105–113. doi:10.1177/003803857801200106
- Wetherell, M. (1998). Positioning and interpretative Repertoires: Conversation analysis and Post-Structuralism in dialogue. *Discourse & Society*, 9(3), 387–412.
doi:10.1177/0957926598009003005
- What does an aid worker pack? (2008). Retrieved from
<http://chasingcarly.blogspot.co.nz/p/what-does-aid-worker-pack.html>
- Widdicombe, S. (1993). Autobiography and change: Rhetoric and authenticity of “Gothic” style. In E. Burman & I. Parker (Eds.), *Discourse Analytic Research: Repertoires and Readings of Texts in Action*. London: Routledge.
- Widdicombe, S., & Wooffitt, R. (1994). *The language of youth subcultures: Social identity in action*. New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Willig, C. (2001). *Introducing qualitative research in psychology: Adventures in theory and method* (2nd ed.). United Kingdom: Open University Press.
- Willig, C. (2008). *Introducing qualitative research in psychology: Adventures in theory and method* (2nd ed.). Maidenhead, England: McGraw Hill/Open University Press.

- Wong, J., & Olsher, D. (2000). Reflections on Conversation Analysis and Nonnative Speaker Talk: An Interview with Emanuel A. Schegloff. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, 11(1), 111–128.
- Wooffitt, R., & Widdicombe, S. (2006). Interaction in interviews. In Drew, Raymond, & Weinberg (Eds.), *Talk and Interaction in Social Research Methods* (pp. 28–49). London: Sage.
- Yin, R. K. (2003). *Case study research: Design and methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Yuval-Davis, N. (2006). Belonging and the politics of belonging. *Patterns of Prejudice*, 40(3), 197–214. doi:10.1080/00313220600769331
- Yuval-Davis, N. (2011). *The politics of belonging: Intersectional Contestations*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Yuval-Davis, N., Anthias, F., & Kofman, E. (2005). Secure borders and safe haven and the gendered politics of belonging: Beyond social cohesion. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 28(3), 513–535. doi:10.1080/0141987042000337867
- Zhong, C.-B., & Leonardelli, G. J. (2008). Cold and lonely: Does social exclusion literally feel cold? *Psychological Science*, 19(9), 838–842. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9280.2008.02165.x
- Zwolinski, J. (2008). Biopsychosocial responses to social rejection in targets of relational aggression. *Biological Psychology*, 79(2), 260–267. doi:10.1016/j.biopsycho.2008.06.006

Appendix A

Working with local communities: a Study of Aid workers in the Field

About the Project

I would like to invite you to take part in a study on international aid and development workers' everyday experiences of working in the field. The objective is to better understand the issues that impact on your comfort, security and ability to effectively conduct your work.

This research is being conducted independently, and will be used as the basis of a PhD thesis at Edinburgh University, supervised by Dr Sue Widdicombe.

What it Involves

To participate in this study you'll need to be available for an interview with me, which typically takes between 40-60 minutes. The discussion may take place either in person, by Skype or by telephone, depending on your location and what is most convenient for you. I'm interested in your experiences of living and working in the field, doing aid and development work. I'd like to audio-record the interview so that I have an accurate record of what you say. Extracts from your interview (and others') will be used in the course of writing up my PhD. Using information from all the interviews I conduct I'll look for common themes and patterns, these will then be used as the basis on which claims will be made in the analysis.

Your Rights

During the interview you don't have to answer any questions you don't want to. If you change your mind about me using the information from your interview, you can let me know any time in the two weeks following and I'll delete your interview from my records.

If you have any questions as a result of reading this information sheet, please contact me through one of the channels below.

Confidentiality/Anonymity

Please be aware the data you provide will not be linked to any identifying information, and will only be used for analytic purposes. The data will be used in writing up my PhD, and may be used at conferences, in academic journal articles or in reports. If an excerpt of your interview is used, no identifying information will be linked to it, and any information contained in the excerpt that could identify you or anyone else will be edited or omitted. The data will be stored securely and only my supervisor and I will have access to it.

For Further Information

I will be glad to answer your questions about this study at any time. You may contact me at the following

Email: kaisawilson@gmail.com

Phone: 0044 7531026866

Address: Psychology Department
7 George Square
Edinburgh, EH89JZ
United Kingdom

To request a copy of the final results of this study please contact me, Kaisa Wilson, through one of the above channels. This project was approved by the Psychology Research Ethics Committee at Edinburgh on 31/05/11.

Appendix B

Working with local communities: a Study of Aid workers in the Field

Informed Consent Form

You are invited to take part in a study on international aid and development workers' everyday experiences of working in the field.

By signing below, you are agreeing that (1) you have read and understood the Participant Information Sheet; (2) questions about your participation in this study have been answered satisfactorily; (3) you are willing to take part in this study; (4) you agree to your interview being recorded and used as data.

Participant's Name (Printed)*

Participant's signature*

Date

Kaisa Wilson

Name of person obtaining consent (Printed)

Signature of person obtaining consent

**Participants wishing to preserve some degree of anonymity may use their initials*

Appendix C

Transcription symbols (Jefferson, 2004)

[] Square brackets indicate overlapping speech. They are placed to indicate the position of the overlap.

(0.8) Numbers in round brackets indicate pauses in seconds (in this case, eight tenths of a second).

(.) A full stop in rounded brackets indicates a micro pause (that is, a pause that is too short to time).

right= Equals signs indicate 'latching', where there is no pause between one speaker and another.

never Underlining indicates stressed words and syllables.

°yeah° Degree signs indicate quieter speech and whispering.

DIFFICULT Capitals indicate words that were said loudly.

u::h Colons indicate elongation of the prior sound; the number of colons indicates the length of the elongation.

((name)) Double rounded brackets indicate actions, describe words that have been removed in order to maintain confidentiality or otherwise include notes from the transcriber.

↑I was↓ Up arrows indicate increased pitch and down arrows indicate decreased pitch.

>I don't< 'Greater than' and 'less than' signs enclose speeded up talk.

w- Hyphens indicate sounds and words that have been cut off.

yeah? Question marks indicate a 'questioning' (i.e., rising) intonation.

heh Voiced laughter. C

ha(h)nge Laughter within speech is indicated by the letter 'h' in round brackets.

hhh Indicates aspiration (out-breaths).

Appendix D

Advertisement Posted on Reliefweb.int between May and October 2011

We are looking for male and female humanitarian workers with experience working in the field to participate in some research being conducted at Edinburgh University. The study will look at humanitarian workers' experiences of living and working in communities other than their own, and the security implications associated with that.

The results of the research will be published and used to inform future policy among aid agencies, so your time now will help future aid and development workers and the communities in which they work! Participation involves just 40-60mins of your time for an interview via skype.

Please contact Kaisa Wilson at this address: A.Wilson-17@sms.ed.ac.uk for more information about participating and to set up a time for an interview. Your participation would be very much appreciated.